

# SOUTHERN QUARTERLY REVIEW.

---

JANUARY, 1855.

---

ART. I.—REVIEW OF “THE NORTH AND SOUTH,” *a pamphlet re-published from the editorials of the New York Tribune.*

THERE is perhaps this analogy between physical and political systems: that the same organization contains at once the germs of development and the seeds of decay. The law of growth and progress is clogged with the conditions of stagnation and decline.

Under this analogy the political fatalist would abandon the care of a system which but partakes of the lot of mortality, nor implicate his own welfare in the tendencies to inevitable destruction. But the patriot, like the Christian, acknowledges no selfish doctrine, the forebodings of a finite judgment do not justify inaction, nor does the certainty of a fatal result exonerate him from the obligations of a positive duty. It is in this sense that we regard our duties to the Federal Union.

Whilst we cannot assert that it will escape the common destiny of human institutions, we are determined to omit no effort to restore its earlier character, and to transmit its blessings to those who come after us. The principles of vitality which animate the Union, are the freedom of civil and religious opinion, the sovereignty of the States, and the physical inducements which it offers to the enterprise of mankind.

The germs of dissolution consist in a tendency to Federal consolidation, or to numerical supremacy and the dissonance of sectional interest, incident to an extended territory and a peculiar social institution. The best method then of restoring the Union to its original theory, consists in restricting the Federal Government to the exercise of its undoubted powers. In vindicating the equality and sovereignty of the States, and in so reconciling interests apparently hostile, as to render them reciprocal if not identical.

But the preservation of the Union in that spirit in which alone it could receive the sanction of freemen, is fraught with many difficulties. It is subject to the powerful hostility of open foes, who would batter down its ramparts with the artillery of argument. It is exposed to the insidious enmity of pretended friends, who pour into the crevices of a dissonant interest the subtle prejudices of race or section. This may explode under the slightest collision and shatter the fabric to atoms.

Besides, political, like physical organisms, are infested by certain parasitical vermin. They spring from *larvæ*, hatched into mischief by the heat of political corruption, and their mission seems to be the destruction of the body which gave them life.

The friends of the Union in the South have gone to the verge of sectional confidence in allaying the hostility against it. A race of statesmen, Titanic in their efforts, have contended against its continuance. They have subscribed a truce to await the result of further efforts to restore its original action. Compromising nothing, conceding nothing, they have acquiesced in the assurances of their more hopeful fellow-citizens. This truce will be religiously kept—their parole will never be violated. For this we will pledge ourselves. But we find that whilst this formidable opposition to the Union has been quieted, a school of Disunion has been secretly and sedulously taught in the Northern States. Its object is sectional aggrandizement for the sake of sectional supremacy. Its means consist in the immigration of foreign

members and the annexation of all the British Provinces of North America. It desires to force the Southern States to a dissolution, that thereby they may be deprived of the political fellowship of the just and patriotic men of the North, that they may be exposed to the enmity of European nations, hostile to their spirit of liberty and jealous of their peculiar productions, and thus, that they may be virtually subjugated by the free labor and free institutions of a Northern Confederacy. The design to exasperate the South into disunion has happily failed through the predominant patriotism of the American people, who have compelled concessions to the wounded feelings and injured interests of the South. But the conspirators are not defeated. They pursue their plans systematically. They seek to sow in the popular mind of the North a religious difference between the two sections. The canons of this creed are:

Slavery is a sin for which the citizens of the Union are responsible.

They may employ any social or political means to expiate this sin.

It should be eradicated at the consequence of disunion.

The inhabitants of the slave-holding States are neither in morals nor usages worthy of association.

It results from these doctrines that there is a moral discrepancy between the North and South, which it is the duty of the North to remove by any means within her power. The moral organization of this sentiment is carried out by religious appeals and sectional defamation. Divines avouch the sanction of holy writ for a crusade against the infidelity of bondage. Professors of fictional literature get up exaggerated pictures of particular evils and blazon them before the world as the invariable results of a particular system. Theorists who have fled from a despotism which they had not the courage to resist, speculate under the freedom of speech guaranteed to them by the slave-holder, upon the iniquities of his institutions. Such is the agency employed in organizing a war against the South. The political organiza-



tion is even more formidable. It is headed by statesmen who profess the loftiest patriotism. They assert that their duty to morality exonerates them from the obligations of the oath which they have taken and the constitution which they have subscribed, and that their consideration for the happiness of the human race should outweigh their friendship for fellow-citizens of the same Commonwealth. The design of these statesmen is to acquire a preponderant population and a large majority of States; to unite this power in a common political sentiment. They may then cause an abolition amendment to the Federal Constitution to be adopted by three-fourths of the States, and thus place the South in the dilemma of either violating the constitutional compact into which she has entered, or of surrendering her rights and her property. Following in the wake of these movements and contributing to them both, we find mercenary authors who reduce all the advantages of the Union to a pecuniary equivalent, and value its permanence according to the impartial report of its balance sheet.

We trust that God will bring to naught the machinations of these prophets of Baal who pretend to interpret in his name.

We remit the political conspirators to a more appropriate arena. There they will find the champions of Union and politics with lance in rest and visor down. We rely upon truth and a sense of public justice to refute the specious calumnies of the last and most unscrupulous class who co-operate in the dissolution of the Union or in the perversion of its principles. To this clan belongs the publication called "The North and the South," and to the refutation of some of its principal fallacies we have devoted this article.

In doing so, we do not aspire to convince the author or his disciples, but to vindicate the South from unjust aspersions before the tribunal of the world.

Those who will read "The North and the South," will find that it would be impossible to pursue in detail the innumerable imputations with which it abounds. But it will be



found to contain certain assertions which are repeatedly restated in different forms and enforced with all the force of figures and all the zeal of declamation. We have therefore condensed the substance of the work into certain propositions, which we will state in order and accompany with an argument.

The scope of argument may be thus stated :

1. Slavery is a social sin, for whose continuance all living under the same confederacy are morally responsible.
2. The South desires the dissolution of the Union.
3. The North is then absolved from any obligation in morals or comity to maintain the Union.
4. The North produces more in value than the South. It is more prosperous and intelligent. It profits but little by its intercourse with the South.
5. Since it neither comports with the morality, comity, nor interests of the North to continue the Union, therefore,
6. The Union ought, in the opinion of the author of the North and the South, to be divided !

The first proposition which we have stated is the postulate upon which the whole argument of abolition rests. It is a question of ethics, upon which the belief of the parties could not be changed by any argument of ours ; we shall therefore confine ourselves to a consideration of the political questions involved in the subject under consideration.

*The South desires a dissolution of the Union.*

This is a gratuitous assertion. As upon this rests the allegation that the North is thereby absolved from any fraternal obligation, we proceed to its refutation. The ground of this assertion is found in an able argument upon the subject of disunion published during the compromise contest of 1850. This argument contends that in the event of a separation "The trade of the South would grow like a field of young corn when the long expected showers descend after a withering drought. The South now loses the use of some 130 or 140 millions a year of her capital, and also pays to the federal government at least 26 millions of taxes, 23 of which are

spent beyond her borders. This great stream of taxation continually bears the wealth of the South far away on its waves, and small indeed is the portion which ever returns in refreshing clouds to replenish its sources. Turn it back to its natural channel, and the South will be relieved of 15 millions of taxes—to be left where they can be most wisely expended, in the hands of the payers; and the other 11 millions will furnish salaries to her people and encouragement to her labor. Restore to her the use of the 130 or 140 millions a year of her produce for the foreign trade, and all her ports will throng with business. Norfolk and Charleston and Savannah, so long pointed at by the North as a proof of the pretended evils of slavery, will be crowded with shipping, and their warehouses crammed with merchandise.”

“The real triumph of the South,” says a journal which sees neither advantage nor honor in the Federal Union, “consists in a dissolution of the Union.” Such are the authorities upon which the work under consideration bases these grave charges of sectional opinion.

One of the most common arts of those who want the courage to meet an adversary consists in attributing to him opinions which he has never uttered, and proceeding to triumph over a position which has never been defended.

We are compelled to deny at the threshold that these propositions embody the opinions of the South, according to any exposition either legislative or primary. If such had been its opinions they would have been avowed, and maintained to the desired consummation. The South would not have left the declaration of its position to anonymous pamphlets, however able, nor local editorials howsoever sincere. We will give an extract from history almost contemporaneous. It will require no voucher, for it is fresh in the memory of all. There arose in 1850 a violent contest in the South upon the question whether the Union ought to be dissolved or endured. Upon that question was arrayed a conflict of the most exciting and momentous character, for it was a contest



of brethren interested in the same inheritance and committed to the same destiny. The argument quoted as the present opinion of the South was put in during that contest. It had the weight due to its ability and to its facts. The question was settled by acquiescence in the compromise of 1850. There has since been an universal amnesty. The South is calm and united, and so sincere has been the determination to abide by that Compromise as "a settlement in substance," that several of the most prominent advocates of extreme action at that time are now the trusted representatives of the Federal Government in stations of high administrative and diplomatic trust. The tardy act of justice rendered by the North in expunging the black lines of sectional humiliation which excluded the Southern access to a common domain, and the signal rebuke which the organized enemies of the South have more recently received, tend still more to reconcile the South to its political connection; and these measures, if confirmed in good faith, will restore the relations which originally existed between the two sections.

But the taunt of some individual is cited which imputes to the North "a base cupidity, a servile truckling and subserviency," and it is charged with a mercenary meanness in submitting to a connection with a people who despise it. "What," exclaims this insidious enemy of sectional friendship—"shall we say of the sons of the North, always ready to knock themselves down to the highest bidder to Northern men with Southern principles? Can we say of them other than that their course has been generally marked by cupidity, truckling and subserviency to the South?"

The conduct of the slanderer who puts words into the mouth of one person which he has never spoken, and taunts another with indignities which have never been offered, is visited by society with unanimous execration. What other penalty can be expected by an author who bases a national argument upon the expressions of individual prejudice, and would combine in his view the envious malignity of the fanatic with the honest indignation of insulted sectional-



ism? Such is the *quo animo* with which the author asserts that,

*The Federal Government has been administered for the exclusive benefit of the South.*

The specific proof adduced to sustain this proposition would be very conclusive, if true. It is that the acquisition of Federal territory has been exclusively on Southern account. To render this wrong more aggravated, we are told that it has been accompanied by a total change in the original policy of the government; for that, whereas the Government once favored universal emancipation, it has been now converted "to the propagandism and expansion of slavery."

That public policy once tended in almost all the States to emancipation, is without question. Slavery was once considered a profitable investment in human labor. It terminated in certain States, because it was no longer thought to be so. For this reason, it receded from Massachusetts to Maryland. Commencing in interest, it has been combined with certain political and social considerations. It will terminate in the same considerations. Not otherwise. The change of policy may then be explained without imputing to those who introduced slavery, motives more mercenary than those which actuated those who abolished it.

The African slave was originally employed in the rudest labor. He was fitted for nothing else—nor was there any thing else for him to do in the Northern States, for as yet manufacturing and mining were unknown. The free labor of these States was then sufficient for the purposes of agriculture, and men could not afford to support laborers who aided to consume the products of the common toil, and thus threw the owner out of employment. The New England farmer could not then keep a Caliban to split logs, bear burdens, and sleep in stupid inactivity when unemployed. Under these considerations slave labor was too costly for the agricultural productions of the North. It was a bad investment. The slaves were, therefore, either set free, or sold South, where their labor was more valuable. Northern emancipation was then the

retrenchment of an unprofitable expense, or the modification of an injudicious investment. It was not the acknowledgment or expiation of a moral wrong.

Under the same reasoning it was even proposed to abolish slavery in the staple growing States of Maryland and Virginia. There was at that time no other industrial labor for slaves except the production of provisions and the single staple tobacco. The helpless members of the slave family consumed almost all that the able-bodied could make upon the impoverished lands of the Atlantic coast; the staple which they produced scarcely quit the cost of its production and sale in a foreign market. The average price of tobacco and slaves, was little more than one-fourth of their present value. The wisdom of the Federal Government had not bestowed upon us then new territory, adapted to culture, nor had steam given us access to that which we already possessed. The Abbe Raynal,\* writing about the United Colonies, *demonstrated* that they could support but ten millions of people, and founded his argument upon the exhaustion of staple culture, and the incapacity of their lands for agricultural restoration. The letters of General Washington will prove the unproductive nature of slave labor; and his repeated propositions to liberate his negroes, were based on no acknowledgment that he had done wrong to keep them in bondage, but in a general belief of the unprofitable character of their labor as well as the injury which it was believed they inflicted upon the industrial habits of the people. Such were also the arguments upon which Mr. Jefferson advocated emancipation, they were but a repetition of the same reasons which had influenced the Northern States, and they were reiterated by the advocates of emancipation of a later day. But the argument having been submitted to the people of Virginia, they decided against emancipation, and the wisdom of their decision has been strengthened with the developed difficulties of a free negro population, and the offensive interference of those who,

\* Raynal's Indies.



having disposed of their own interest, proposed to compel others to follow their example. In this connection we will give at once an historical fact, and an unanswerable argument upon the question of policy. Mr. Jefferson, one of the wisest and most original reformers that ever lived, proposed the following schedule of constitutional amendments for Virginia :\*

1. Freedom of religious worship.
2. Extension of the right of suffrage, and the choice of officers by popular election.
3. The repeal of the law of primogeniture.
4. The establishment of a system of State education.
5. The emancipation of the slaves.

Every one of these measures except the last has been carried out almost in the terms dictated by that great statesman. Had he lived to see the impulse given to industrial pursuits in Virginia, had he seen her improved agriculture, her growing manufactures, her opening mines, her spreading commerce, had he seen the drain of emigration staunch, and the steady accession from other States, had he seen the lands of Virginia quadrupled in value, her people contented and employed, her schools well attended, her colleges crowded with students, and her university sending to the halls of Legislation and the arena of active life, men competent to compete with any rivals, he would have seen the cause of temperance, and the habits of industry held in honor, racers and gamblers despised, and professional politicians derided.

Had he seen the slave partake of the elevation of increased value, and improved intelligence,—the trusted manager repairing the ravages which his own ancestor had caused,—the skillful foreman in the forge or factory, receiving a fair proportion of his own wages in those things which he would have been compelled, if free, to have purchased with them—raised from the degradation of compulsory labor, and taught to work for a common maintenance, with a common interest—had Mr. Jefferson, and those who reasoned with

\* Notes on Virginia, 1787.



him, lived to this day, the argument against the unprofitable character of slave labor would have been met, and the idea that slave labor degraded and demoralized the freemen who resided in the same community, would have been exploded. The policy of emancipation having been thus based upon the peculiar advantages of the white, and in no sin or injury committed towards the black, would have produced the same change upon his mind that it has done upon others; and he would have maintained an institution which he had once deemed it politic to abandon.

But we will contend that *the change of policy to which we have adverted has arisen from causes in which the North is deeply implicated*. When the introduction of machine spindles, and the invention of the cotton gin gave employment to the laborers of Old and New England, it rendered the opening of new fields of staple production in Bombay and Georgia as necessary as the use of spermaceti, whalebone, and seal skin rendered the exploration of the Arctic Ocean. This world-demand for a particular staple sent human enterprise into the cotton region as the *sacra fames auri* sends them to California or Australia. This order for cotton produced a demand for slave labor, which at once raised its value, and enhanced its consideration, because it provided employment for cotton spinners, and opened a market for their manufactures. Great Britain invaded the distant and peaceful Indies. She overthrew thrones. She plundered empires. She slew thousands. She subjugated millions of tribute slaves to her dominion. She did this to acquire the monopoly of that great fabric that clothes the world.

The same interest in the United States stimulated a policy more peaceful in its measures, but strictly analogous in its results. In the anxiety for industrial independence which succeeded the war of 1812, a tariff was adopted, which afforded adequate protection to American manufactures. This measure was an indirect encouragement to slave labor.

This rendered necessary the extension of the culture of cotton over the Territory which we then possessed, and ren-

dered the nation tolerant of any new acquisitions suited to the same purpose. It extended the great home market within which the embryo manufactures of the Union might grow and strengthen for a conflict with the world. It promised the abundance and cheapness of competition. It promised the extended demand of growing and prosperous communities. It combined home production of the staple with home consumption of the perfected fabric. Annexation of staple territory was thus as much a protection to the manufacturer as if it had been equated to dollars and cents, and assessed specifically or *ad valorem* upon the competing manufacturers of a foreign country. These were the causes of annexation. Territorial acquisition and the Tariff were twins, born of Northern sagacity and Northern enterprise.

So far from the South having founded this system, she resisted that Tariff whose undoubted effects were to enhance the demand for her own staple. Nor is it wonderful that she should have done so. *As a measure of sectional policy, the Southern Atlantic States might well have looked upon the acquisition of new Territory as injurious to them.* The immediate and inevitable result of this policy was to draw off the population and property of these States, and thus reduce their lands to a nominal value. Can any one, who reasons from the principles of social nature, suppose that Virginia or South Carolina would, for the sake of adding to their political influence, have consented to open almost in free gift, lands fresh and productive of a staple manifold more valuable than their own? Was it of advantage to either, that their lands should have been abandoned, as they literally were, under the influence of the cotton mania of 1834-6—that their most enterprising and valued children should have thronged the thoroughfares to the Southwest, in one long and sorrowful exodus of wealth and energy? Were they strengthened by that competition? On the contrary, it brought them not even political power. The slaves and whites who emigrated would have had identically the same numerical representation in the Federal Government before their de-

parture, as afterward. We have as high an opinion of the wisdom and patriotism of these States as any one can have. It is in proof that they did not introduce the policy of territorial acquisition, and that the first effect of that policy was almost destructive to them. It was for a long time the chief cause of our exhaustion and decline, but attributed to other causes. They had as yet no other employment except agriculture for their labor, and that labor was worth more elsewhere.\*

*The acquisition of Federal territory has not been made for the benefit of the South.*

We will here examine historically the true causes of territorial acquisition. We presume it will not be contended that the honest purchase of land is a crime. Nor will it be denied that the free institutions, and rapid growth of the republic rendered indispensable a policy, common to every form of government from the annexation of Canaan to that of Canada, inclusive. The morality of annexation admitted, it is natural that the United States would have expanded on the West and South, when there was no territory to be acquired on the North. To Canada we have three times offered the boon of freedom, and she has rejected the boon with arms in her hands. Settled by royalists and refugees from the independent colonies, and by employees and dependants of the British crown, with every motive of attachment to monarchy, and hatred to republicanism—with established distinctions of rank and religion. It must be an exalted fanaticism, or a depraved regard for free institutions

\* As a proof at once of the injury to the oldest slaves States, and a comment upon the propriety of establishing a moral proposition by a census return, we note that the difference between the slaves of Virginia in 1830 and 1840, should, according to his ratio of measure, have gained about 150,000. These the author of North and South considers as exports, and indulges in an ironical insinuation of the cause of sale. The decline in the white population of Virginia in the same decade, corresponded proportionally with that of the slaves. This decline was caused by emigration. The slave owner abandoned his lands, and carried his own family and slaves to the irresistible attractions of the new cotton States. The loss, which nearly depopulated and destroyed Virginia, is converted by this casuist into a positive gain of nearly \$12,000,000 per annum.



which would cause an American to prefer the 'society of those who fought against his ancestors, to that of those who fought with them. But fanatics are, however, as little troubled with ancestors as with principles.

The first territorial acquisition of the confederacy was the great North-western territory. It was wrested from the power of the savages by the unaided prowess of a Southern State. Its title was confirmed by the result of a successful struggle with England. This territory was accepted as common property by the States of the confederacy, and a voluntary condition imposed by the donor which for ever excluded it from the category of Southern States, and classed it with those of the North. It was erected into the great States of Ohio, Illinois, Indiana, and Michigan. The first great acquisition of territory by the Federal Government was thus for the benefit of the free States of the North.

Very soon after this magnificent concession had been confirmed, the people who inhabited it, with the whole population of the Ohio valley, endeavored to obtain control of the Mississippi river, because this was the natural outlet to the ocean. The revocation of the right of deposit at New Orleans produced a state of excitement throughout the West and Northwest that threatened the conquest of Louisiana. Such was the solicitude upon this subject that Mr. Jefferson says in his annual message:

“Congress witnessed, at their last session, the extraordinary agitation produced in the public mind by the suspension of our right of deposit at the port of New Orleans, no assignment of another place having been made according to treaty. They were sensible that the continuance of that privation would be more injurious to our nation than any consequences which could flow from any mode of redress, but reposing just confidence in the good faith of the government whose officer had committed the wrong, friendly and reasonable representations were resorted to, and the right of deposit was restored.

Previous, however, to this period, we had not been unaware of the danger to which our peace would be perpetually exposed while so important a key to the commerce of the

Western country remained under foreign power. Difficulties, too, were presenting themselves as to the navigation of other streams, which, arising within our territories, pass through those adjacent. Propositions had, therefore, been authorized for obtaining, on fair conditions, the sovereignty of New Orleans, and of other possessions in that quarter interesting to our quiet, to such extent as was deemed practicable. \* \* \* \* \* While the property and sovereignty of the Mississippi and its waters secure an independent outlet for the produce of the Western States, and an uncontrolled navigation through their whole course, free from collision with other powers, and the dangers to our peace from that source, the fertility of the country, its climate and extent, promise in due season important aids to our treasury, an ample provision for our posterity, and a widespread field for the blessings of freedom and equal laws.

With the wisdom of Congress it will rest to take those ulterior measures which may be necessary for the immediate occupation and temporary government of the country, for its incorporation into the Union; for rendering the change of government a blessing to our newly adopted brethren; for securing to them the rights of conscience and of property; for confirming to the Indian inhabitants their occupancy and self-government, establishing friendly and commercial relations with them, and for ascertaining the geography of the country acquired."

It is obvious from these extracts that the acquisition of Louisiana was no Southern movement. When it shall be also remembered that 'it was acquired by a Southern president, the author of the resolutions of 1787, whose opinions in favor of emancipation have been commended by the work under review, no one can charge a sectional purpose.

The acquisition of Louisiana was followed by the first unlawful movement for the acquisition of coterminous foreign territory. According to the same great authority, "Designs were in agitation in the *Western* [our italics] country," and "the prime mover there was Aaron Burr, heretofore distinguished by the favor of his country." Here was a filibustering expedition got up in the Western country, headed by a Northern leader. The first object of this enterprise was "the severance of the Union of these States by the Al-

legany mountains." The second, "an attack on Mexico." The Southern States of Kentucky and Tennessee promptly co-operated for the suppression of the enterprise. There were few or no Southern men engaged in this enterprise. Burr was arrested by a Southern President, and his memory is execrated to this day in the South as a traitor to his country.

The acquisition of Florida sprung from national causes. During the war of 1812, the savages from Michilimackinac to Mobile had banded to co-operate with our common foe. The British and Spanish Government had armed and harbored them. They were dislodged at Pensacola, even by a violation of international amity. At a later day, certain adventurers occupied points in Florida as a depot for contraband goods. The Revenue laws of the United States were violated with impunity. The peninsula of Florida commanded the whole course of domestic trade between the Mississippi and the Atlantic ports. The Gulf and reefs were infested with pirates and wreckers who enjoyed the connivance, if not the protection of the provincial authorities. Besides these national causes of annexation, there were also questions of commercial spoliations and unadjusted boundary between our government and that of Spain. These were the indictments to the annexation of Florida. They constituted a national necessity sufficient to overrule even the conflicting interests of the Southern Atlantic States.

"This cession was nevertheless received as the means of indemnifying our citizens in a considerable sum, the presumed amount of their losses. Other considerations of great weight urged the cession of the territory of Spain. It was surrounded by the territories of the United States on every side except that on the ocean. Spain had lost its authority over it, and falling into the hands of adventurers connected with savages, it was made the means of increasing annoyance and injury to our Union in many of its most essential interests. By this cession, then, Spain ceded a territory in reality of no value to her, and obtained concessions of the highest importance by the settlement of long standing differences with the United States, affecting their respective



claims and limits, and likewise relieved herself of the objection of a treaty, relating to it which she has failed to fulfil, and also from the responsibility incident to the most flagrant and pernicious abuses of her rights when she could not support her authority."

Such was the language of the Executive.\*

The annexation of Texas was not a sectional, but a party question. The great mass of the Southern whigs headed by a Southern statesman, opposed its acquisition, the great mass of the Northern democrats advocated it.

The value of Texas depended almost entirely upon her capacity to produce the great material of Northern manufactures, and the expanded addition to the Northern Home market. The result of this annexation to the old Atlantic States, has been competition of land and labor. She has furnished a market for Northern goods, and employment for Northern Capital.

These are the chief acts of annexation performed by the Federal Government, and it will have been seen that in no case has annexation been proposed by the South, or failed to enure to the benefit of the North. Indeed, the manufacture of cotton imparts a greater value to cotton than even production. This article, neither spun, woven, nor to a great extent worn in the Southern States, employs Northern labor, brings freight to Northern ships, territorial and physical strength to the whole nation.

But says this insidious author, "*What had in all this time been purchased for the North? Nothing. Not even a foot of land!*" Were there no commercial wars? No treaties opening the trade ports of other nations to the enterprise of our own? No protection by bounties on Northern shipping, fisheries, and manufactures? No deposit of national millions to the credit of the Northern cities? "*Not even a foot of Northern land!*" Would Britain have sold a foot of her soil? Would she have ceded jurisdiction over the most barren spot in her Cisatlantic dominions? Would Canada come into the

\* Mr. Monroe's Message.

federal fold if invited to do so? Like Cuba, she prides herself in being loyal to the monarchy to which she has clung through every vicissitude. Until then it shall appear that there was any Northern territory which might have been acquired, it will be unjust to reproach the Government with partiality to the South. Until it shall have been proven that the Southern States have desired or profited by the acquisition of territory, they ought to be acquitted of the charge of having forced the policy upon the government. But in the same connection it is charged that,

*The wars of the Republic have been undertaken for the aggrandizement of the Southern States.*

In evidence of this, we are told that the Mexican War "was prosecuted for the boundary of Texas, so was war threatened for that of 54° 40'. It was fought in one case and compromised in the other. The Mexican war was advocated by Mr. Dallas, Mr. Marcy, Mr. Buchanan, and other Northern Statesmen. It was opposed by Mr. Calhoun, Mr. Clay, and other Southern Statesmen. But we need not take individual action as the explanation of national policy. The Congressional debates will show that it was regarded as a political, not a sectional question. The opposition endeavor to fasten upon the administration the responsibility of having waged the war for purposes of party aggrandizement. But we may ask what section profited most by that war? Its expenditure of more than one hundred millions was paid for the pork and mules of Cincinnati, the shipping of Boston, the merchandise of New York, the manufactures of Philadelphia, the military equipments of Springfield. The incidental advantages of exchange and deposits, upon this vast expenditure, and the purchase money of the new territory enured to the benefit of the banks and capitalists of the North.

This war resulted in the acquisition of California. California was organized and admitted into the Union as a free State. Its gold crop, valued at, perhaps, one hundred millions per annum, goes direct to New York, and even that is scarcely regarded as more than an equivalent for the provisions of the West, the manufactures and the freights of the North.

It is also asserted that the *war of 1812 was undertaken for the South.*

This theory of our author would imply that the South, having no commercial interest at stake, felt more keenly for the national honor, than that section directly interested in the freedom of the seas. This we do not choose to assert, but refer our readers for the causes of this war, and the comparative patriotism of those who waged it, to that standard work the Olive Branch, written by Matthew Carey, of Philadelphia. We are contented to leave the defence of the South upon this point in the hands of a citizen of the North.

We think we have established that the war and acquisitions of the Republic have been made at the instance and resulted to the advantage of the Northern States.

Having demonstrated the immorality and offences of the South to his own satisfaction, the work under review undertakes to prove that the *prosperity of the North is greater than that of the South.* The first branch of this proposition states the manufacturing prosperity of the North, and estimates its value by computing every thing that enters into the production of its fabrics. This wealth is attributed to the frequency of social "exchanges which are repeated from month to month, throughout the year. The market-gardener furnishes cabbages and potatoes, peas and beans, to the man who converts them into coal. Thence they go as coal, to another, who converts them into pig-iron; thence to the rolling-mill, whence they come out as bars; thence to the shops, from which they come out as axes, spades, plows, or steam-engines; and thus there is a constant and unceasing motion in the produce of the North, and from this motion come the 'power and gain,' which by our Southern friends are attributed to the Union. The manufactures of Massachusetts amount to not less than \$150,000,000. Her shoe manufacture alone is \$37,000,000. Those of the city of New York, in 1850, amounted to \$105,000,000, and those of Philadelphia were fully equal, and probably greater. Those of Cincinnati were \$40,000,000. Pittsburgh and Cincinnati must now considerably exceed a hundred



millions. At the present time they are all very far greater in amount. The iron trade, in its various departments, from the smelting of the ore to the finishing of the steam-engine, cannot be estimated at the present time at less than \$130,000,000, nor the coal trade at less than \$20,000,000; the manufacture of ships is more than \$20,000,000; newspapers, magazines, and engravings, amount to many millions. Add to the infinite quantity of manufactures scattered throughout New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and other northern States, the mining of lead and copper, the enormous product of lumber, the ice trade, the production of houses, and the quantity of labor and manure applied to the improvement of land, while the South is every where exhausting its soil; and it will readily be seen how enormous is the production of the North as compared with that of the South. The earnings of canals, canal boats, and railroads are \$80,000,000; and if we estimate the value of the property carried at only ten times the cost of transportation, we obtain \$800,000,000. The tonnage of the North is little short of four millions, almost half a million of which is moved by steam; and if we take the gross earnings of this at only one dollar per ton, per month, we have nearly fifty millions, but they are probably considered above a hundred millions. The *net* value of the property transported on the lakes and rivers, by canals, in coasters, and on railroads, is estimated by Mr. Andrews, in his Report on the Colonial and Lake Trade, (p. 905,) at 3,120,000,000; but a very small proportion of which, as our readers have seen, comes from the South."

We should not consider even the demonstrations of this proposition conclusive of the main argument, that the North was less dependent upon the common form of government than the South. This we shall endeavor to show.

The proposition, that the Northern prosperity is greater than that of the South, is enforced with the following axioms:

1. The profit upon a customer depends upon his ability to purchase.

2. He who has but a dollar, can spend but one hundred cents, consequently,

3. The farmer who has but one hundred bushels of wheat, cannot deal beyond that value, nor can the planter, who has but twenty bales of cotton, violate the same principle.

4. Communities, like individuals, find their power to purchase limited by the ability to sell.

This is the abracadabra of argument. It is the "Presto pass"—the ambidextrous manipulation of the magician. It means nothing. But the accumulation of truisms, under various permutations, prepares us to learn that there must be more trade *among* the people of the North than amongst those of the South. Granted. A mechanical, manufacturing and commercial people, live by numerous exchanges. The planter requires but one. He who converts a pair of boots into loaves of bread, has effected a negotiation between the tanner, the shoe-pegger, the spinner, the weaver, the binder, the farmer, the miller, not to speak of merchants, blacksmiths and grocers. Of course, there is much more trade produced by the transaction, but it is a trade indispensable to the operations of an industrial community. It is a complication of interests, which, like a complication of machinery, is attended with a loss of power in friction. It employs many, and enables them to convert their labor into subsistence, but it does not favor superior wealth, certainly not superior independence.

If, therefore, the productive power of the North be "four times greater than that of the South," because free can accomplish twice as much as compulsory labor, and because machinery works for man—sophisms by the way, for free-men do not labor more upon any specific work than slaves, and whilst machinery works for the North, soil and climate work more effectually for the South—yet if the largest production of this trade goes to support the population we cannot see in it any proof of power. It is a positive deduction of annual subsistence from annual labor. The South relying upon soil, and climate, and products incidental to the cultivation of its market staples, is less dependent upon other

sections, and would suffer less from a separation, or even from isolation.

But this fallacy of estimating the elements of necessity as the evidence of strength, is made particularly palpable in the case taken by the author to show the superior productive capacity of the North. He estimates the hay crop of the North as an offset to the cotton and rice crop of the South.

The inclemency of the climate compels the Northern people to save a large quantity of forage for their cattle during the period when the grass does not grow, and the fields are frozen. The cattle being consumed in the support of the industrial population, it is, of course, a part of the machinery of productions; and it is represented accordingly. This hay crop then is nothing but the Northern substitute for sunshine. In the South hay is almost unnecessary. There the cattle graze during almost the winter and spring. Indeed, the countless herds of Texas and Arkansas subsist without any winter provisions whatsoever. Now, although this pasturage does not appear in the census, yet the cattle enter into the productions of the South, and are computed accordingly. It is a proof of the disadvantages of a bad climate that the Northern people must deduct, from the year, the support of their cattle during the winter. The great productive value then presented as an evidence of Northern wealth, is a positive proof of Northern dependence. It is as if a Russian should cite the costly furs and perpetual fires of his climate, to prove his superior prosperity over the Cuban, who needs nothing more than a segar and a sombrero. The statistical parade of wealth employed in the production of Northern fabrics, is, therefore, wholly irrelevant. If the aggregate of woollen goods, worn at the North, were duly set down at so much per yard, and the fuel consumed at so much per ton, they would only offset the cash value of the Southern climate, which renders such artificial provision for human comfort useless.

But the value of a customer depends upon the amount of



the products consumed by him, and not upon the numerous exchanges indispensable to his own existence. Thus the cotton sold to the North, amounts to more than thirty millions of dollars. This cotton is converted into goods worth more than threefold the original value—a large portion of them are resold in the South. The North then employs its labor in payment for an indispensable staple. Does it not follow that the value of Southern trade to the North must consist in the difference between the raw material and the perfected fabric, less the value of the labor and provisions employed in its completion?

But we shall be told that the South will still sell cotton to the North if the Union be dissolved. Very true. If the North can afford to buy, but whether, when compelled to pay an import duty in the Southern confederacy, and to compete also with pauper labor abroad, it can still buy as much cotton as before, is a question worth considering before the North shall discard the home market which she now enjoys. The South, on the contrary, could sell its cotton to some other manufacturer. Nor would its income be diminished except to the extent that the failure of Northern commerce impaired the ability of the North to purchase. How far this demand may be replaced by the enlargement of foreign orders, or *by the introduction of manufactures within the new confederacy of the South*, we may consider hereafter. At present it is sufficient to repeat, that the Southern States grow a staple indispensable to the employment of Northern manufacturers. If there is no demand for its staples, it can subsist on its production of provisions, by simply employing in cereal agriculture and raising stock, the labor now engaged in staple productions. The Eastern Atlantic States, on the contrary, cannot produce the staple of cotton for the employment of their people. They cannot even produce the provisions necessary for the support of their population. Which section is most dependent upon the intercourse with the other?

In the same connection we note another branch of the same fallacy. We do not admit that the West and North

are identical, for reasons alleged in their proper place. The author compares the gross provision product of the North in an aggregate of nearly two hundred millions of dollars. He estimates the provision product of the South at less, and argues the superior power of the North from that fact. To ascertain the superior value of this product, the aggregate of the provision produced should be compared, not with that of an opposite section, but with the necessities of its own. Granted that there be an excess of provisions produced north of a given line, over that produced south of the line, there is double the population to consume it living north of that line.

To ascertain the true value of this Northern and Western product, we should calculate how much is required for home consumption, and then estimating the excess exported. Out of this exchangeable surplus the South takes something. Then the South is dependent upon the North and West to that extent. A great portion of the South makes its own provisions. It buys from the States of the West—including Missouri, Kentucky, Western Virginia and Tennessee—a large amount of stock and provisions for the cotton and sugar States. But the States of Virginia, North Carolina and Maryland send a great quantity of wheat and flour to Massachusetts and Connecticut. The herring fisheries of Maryland and Virginia contribute also to the supply of the North. The oysters exported to the North and West from the Chesapeake alone, have been estimated at an annual value, greater, perhaps, than the wheat crop of Massachusetts. Lumber is sent from Georgia and Alabama. Ship timber, tar and turpentine from Carolina. It would not then be just to compare the product north of the line, with that of the South, and charge the South with the consumption of the difference. The provision product imported into the South should properly be compared with that exported, and the South indebted to the West—not the North—for the difference.

But within two years after a dissolution, this difference

would be—nothing. We shall then state the relations of sectional dependence thus :

The North depends upon the South for a home market for domestic manufactures and imported merchandise.

The South is dependent upon the North for a given demand for an indispensable staple, and upon the West for a given value of provisions.

The statician who will strike this balance, will show the relative dependence of sections upon each other, not he who calculates the amount consumed by each in the production of exchangeable commodities.

When this is one of the terms of sectional comparison, how can it be wondered at, that the result should be incorrect? The North is credited with all its consumption, except its hay, which is reserved to offset the chief exchangeable commodity of the South. The South is allowed but a paltry balance of exports in tobacco, sugar, rice and molasses. But even these are raw material of Northern manufactures. For New England distils rum; Massachusetts refines sugars, and Connecticut makes segars, in the aggregate little short perhaps of the value allowed for the staples from which they are respectively manufactured.

We conclude our argument upon this proposition by remarking, that though we have heard the dramatic endeavor to prove the value of a wife by computing what she did *not* eat, wear, and spend, we have never before known the wealth of a community estimated by calculating what it did eat, wear, and spend.

The same vein of incoherence runs through the whole argument of the author. Cotton having been excluded from the exports of the South, its corn is put down at half the price per bushel of that in the North. This is done to show that her productive values are less. But it cannot be true; for commerce would equalize the prices by exportation. It cannot be true; because the price of corn in Texas is far above "fifteen cents,"—the price stated,—nor would the fact, if true, consist with the argument of superior inde-



pendence in the North, since a country, having cheap breadstuffs, is generally more prosperous than one in which they are dearer. We repeat, it is not which section consumes the most of its own substances, or enjoys the highest amount of social prosperity, that we are now considering, but which of the two sections profits most by its intercourse with the other. Russia produces, perhaps, more than France; but upon a comparison of their reciprocal contributions to the prosperity of each other, Russia would be more indebted to France for silks and brandies, than France to Russia for linseed or linen duck.

But the author has subsequently set down the true point of comparison when he says :

“In estimating the ‘power and gain’ to the North, resulting from its union with the South, it is required that the reader should remark that *the whole* of their own vast product is in constant course of being exchanged among themselves; whereas it is only the exchangeable *surplus* of the South with which the people outside of those States have any thing to do. The man of New York derives no advantage from the corn that is fed in Virginia to the slave that is raised for exportation to Mississippi. The corn raised in Alabama appears abroad only in the form of cotton, while that of Louisiana comes to the North only as sugar or molasses.”

“What a plague,” then, “have we to do with the buff jerkin,”—the vegetables which “go to the shops of the North to carve out spades, plows, and steam engines?”—with the iron crop of \$30,000,000, or the coal crop of \$20,000,000, or with “the earnings of railroads,” which represent the cost of interchanges? These prove the wealth and the necessities of the North, not its independence.

It is the surplus of production exported which constitutes the profit, so the greater the Southern consumption of Northern manufactures, the greater the Northern profit upon the transaction. So if the aggregate exportable product of the North were quadrupled, and the Southern demand increased in the same ratio, the dependence of the North upon the

South for a market, would be increased precisely in the same ratio, but the author only considers the importation of Southern products into the North, a source of advantage to the latter section. The profit arising upon sale of Northern goods to Southern customers, is not estimated.

*If the Union were dissolved, the trade would continue.*

It is true, the South would sell its products to the North as heretofore, as to a foreign country. But would the North continue to manifest the same ability to purchase? A large part of the Southern staples, now taken at the North, are reimported into the South for consumption. Suppose that consumption be cut off by any cause? The demand would *pro tanto* cease.

But without admitting that the statistical estimate of comparative values produced is either accurate or properly applied, we ask any impartial reader to consider this plain and succinct statement of the relation between the sections.

The Eastern and Northern Atlantic States do not produce the provisions they live upon. Their soil produces no staple for exportation. They depend upon commercial intercourse with other countries for subsistence. They sell merchandise to the South; they send quack medicines and quack science into the South; they cater in every manner for the custom of the South. On the other hand, there are no Southern drummers seeking to sell the staples of the South to the North. Southern people go to Saratoga to buy health; to Philadelphia and New York to buy goods. Does not the social and sectional relation here show a dependence upon the part of the North?

*In the event of Disunion, the Northern Confederacy would be stronger than the South.*

To sustain this theory, the author has divided the States into black and white, like the squares upon a chess-board, and this upon the sole and arbitrary distinction of freedom and slavery. In one division we have fifteen free States, in another twelve slave States, in a third, the three States of Missouri, Maryland and Delaware, which the author is

pleased to deem doubtful. Kentucky and Virginia are kindly loaned for a few years to the Southern system, perhaps to enhance the profits of conquest. We cannot gainsay the proposition unless we except to the reasoning by which the theory is sustained. This we assuredly do. But to show the absurdity of Disunion in the abstract, we give the argument employed to show that Maryland would, in that event, join the Northern Confederacy.

"Maryland is fast becoming a mining and manufacturing State, and the policy of the North favors diversification of employment, and thus furnishes a market for coal and iron, that cannot be obtained in the South. Baltimore has a large trade with the West, and the largest portion of it, that which she has made the greatest efforts to secure, lies north of the Ohio; and it is in that quarter augmentation is most rapid. Her slaves are few in number, and in the event of separation, she would have the guarantee of the North for their possession during the period of preparation for gradual and quiet emancipation; whereas, were she in a Southern Union, but few would remain at the close of a single year from the date of separation from Pennsylvania. Her union with the North is one, therefore, not to be dissolved."

It might have been added that Maryland commands iron, lumber and other material for manufactures. She commands, also, an avenue of access to the abundant West. She enjoys a climate favorable to continuous industry. Already, under the force of these attractions, she has attracted capital and skill. Thus qualified to become the manufacturing State of a Southern Confederacy, she would at once succeed to the monopoly of the home market, stretching from Mason and Dixon's line to Mexico.

Fanatics never reason, therefore those who address them never need do so. But he who assumes to assign destinies to States, should understand perfectly their existing condition. It is said that Maryland possesses a market in the North for her coal and iron. Let us see if she could lose them by adhering to the South.

We are subsequently told that if the Union were dissolved, the South would not decline to sell its staples to the North.



It is also claimed that in the same event Boston will preserve her India trade, New York her China trade, Philadelphia her West India trade. Yet England and Canada send iron and coal to the markets of the United States, though neither of them are willing to unite with our political association. Why, then, should Maryland change her political association to preserve her markets for a staple indispensable to the industry of others? Commerce consists in an intercourse between people of different States. The argument would confine it to those who live under the same form of political rule. But if the future associations of Maryland are to be determined by considerations of relative interest, let us see how she will stand. Maryland possesses inexhaustible mines of coal better adapted than any other in the United States to the generation of steam. To this may be added the immense trade which comes up from the Chesapeake and its tributaries, as well as from North Carolina and Tennessee. This trade has built up the city of Baltimore. As the interest, so the antecedents of Maryland ally her to the South. Maryland was taken from the territory of Virginia. She sympathizes with her sister,

—The mountains look on Marathon  
And Marathon upon the sea.

Mount Vernon is within sight of Maryland, and the thunders of Yorktown reverberated within her hearing. She has fought shoulder to shoulder with Virginia against Indians, English and Abolitionists, and the blood of Gorsuch is unappeased. Still this despicable argument of interest is strengthened by an appeal to fear, lest the prospect of a good coal market should not move her. It is argued that Maryland would cleave to a Northern Union, because, during the short interval of preparation for "gradual and quiet emancipation," they would have the "guarantee of the North" for their "possession!" whereas, if she were a member of a Southern Union, they would escape into Pennsylvania within a year. Maryland is then to be determined in her future association by a guarantee for the hire of her own property for a few years!

But the author is mistaken. The value of slaves in Maryland is not the leading consideration. Nor is the appeal to her interest the proper way to approach an honorable people.

But the argument of interest is as deceptive as it is insulting. If Maryland would go into a confederacy to secure the hire of her own slaves, would it not be more profitable to continue in a confederacy where she might have the benefit of their sales? Would slaves cease to run away or abolitionists to kidnap them, because of the guarantee of the North? Do the guarantees of the present constitution arrest this evil? Such are a specimen of the reasons given by the author why "the Union of Maryland with the North is not to be dissolved." But it will be found that ethnography cannot decide the question. The exact sciences clog the flight of theory. The sun of reason melts the wax from its wings. Geography corroborates the testimony of commerce, and determines that the destinies of Maryland are with that system of states in which she was born. The western territory of Maryland rests upon and is embraced by Virginia. Her eastern division is a peninsula bounded by the Chesapeake and the ocean. From this it will be seen that the access of Maryland to the West lies through the territory, and that the right of way to that trade has been derived from Virginia. It will therefore be obvious that the whole commerce of Maryland must go to sea through the capes of Virginia. It is not therefore probable that with her chief source of commercial sustenance, with her whole means of access to the ocean or the interior within the dominion of a Southern State, Maryland would accede to a Northern confederacy, when, by so doing, she would separate herself from franchises which were conceded to the comity of friendly states, and would be resumed upon the establishment of foreign relations. We repeat that these are specimens of the reasons by which the public mind of the North is prepared for Disunion, by organizing future confederacies upon the arbitrary and delusive allocations of latitude. Reason tells us that men rather divide with reference to interests than of climate or complexion.

Thus if Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, and the whole north-west produce those supplies, which are floated down the great rivers to be converted into cotton, sugar, and tobacco, is it probable that a mere prejudice against the kind of labor that converted them, will deter them from a political connection with their customers? Would they prefer the home market to which they have been always accustomed, or would they prefer paying duties on horses, mules, and hogs, as in Cuba or Jamaica? We have good reasons for believing that if the Northwest were required to choose between the demand and outlet of the South, or the North with its payment in merchandise, and the competition of Canadian breadstuffs, it would prefer rather the cash and staple sales of the South. At all events, we shall expect to hear them speak before they shall be quartered like a diagramatic fowl to be carved for the instruction of beginners. For beneath all this there is a momentous truth which the Eastern States have to learn. There is a Western section as well as a Northern section, and this West is not to be disposed of as an appanage of the North. There is a greater unity of interest between the North-east and the West, than between any other two sections of the Union. The West is the store house of the Union, she possesses all the materials of a manufacturing community. No State will long hold raw material, provisions, and labor, without combining them in some perfected fabric. Cincinnati, Wheeling, and Pittsburg begin to perceive that they are better fitted for manufactures than Springfield, Lowell, or Hartford. They have capital, climate, coal, raw material and mechanical skill. They are many hundred miles nearer the home market than their Eastern competitors. What then hinders the West from intercepting the Southern demand for Northern commodities?

The manufacturer and the consumer have been drawing closer together for many years. The first stride was from Leeds to Lowell. The next will be from Lowell to Cincinnati. The interest of the West and South are therefore identical.



For commerce, unlike chemistry, combines the affinities of opposite not of similar interests. The North and West will offer in market the same fabrics. They are rivals. The South will purchase from both. They are competitors for her favor. The author of disunion in disguise will find, upon working out his own problem, that it converts his allies into his enemies; that two brethren in Weathersfield and Chillicothe, respectively, making and vending corn brooms, will sooner quarrel with each other than with a common customer. They will sooner deal with those who draw their money from the culture and sale of a world-staple, than with one who would pay them in a medium involving several intermediate exchanges, and return at last a commodity which they could have manufactured themselves.

It is obvious that the section which combines within itself all the facilities for reciprocating industry, can better exist alone than one which is dependent for any one of them. The two sections to which we have referred have been, and, happily, are still, in relations of harmonious interest. Under these relations, the Southern section yielded to the North the exclusive pursuit of all those departments of industry indispensable to the common good. These the North was well qualified to conduct. Under this policy, the immense home market of the South and South-west—beginning at Maryland and sweeping round to California—has been protected by a revenue duty, and thrown open in monopoly to the North. If, however, it should be determined to dissolve the confederacy, it is plain that the Southern section could not continue dependent upon a foreign State for a supply of those articles of primary necessity and of social luxury which it requires. Like every other separate nation, the South would establish for itself all those industrial interests indispensable to its independence. There would be foreign alliances, under which reciprocal treaties would secure reciprocal advantages. There would be a policy of national protection for domestic enterprise. There would be an increased determination to render the whole section accessible, and all its resources

available. In one word, the disposition would be to make the South support itself. For, observe, the relations between the Northern and Southern confederacies could not be the same with those which exist between other nations. They would have separated because the one section was too pure to continue under the same form of government, and the other had reason to apprehend that no effort would be spared to destroy the particular interest which had caused the separation, neither interest nor comity then would continue the relations of the sections precisely as they had been. But let us examine the probable results of this separation in its influence upon the commercial prosperity of the North. The author assures his readers that every thing would continue in statu quo. He works out the equation of positive value of the Union to the North at just forty cents a head, whilst the incidental advantage of sectional intercourse would continue. Let us see. The idea of Southern morals sought to be inculcated by those who rely upon sectional jealousy, as a lever of national dissolution, is, that Southern men are haughty, indolent, oppressive, wasteful; plunged in ignorance, and without the resources of capital or skill. We shall not here controvert it. The Southern men who confide in these pages require no proofs. Those who "read to doubt, or read to scorn," would disbelieve them.

But it is plain that a new confederacy, comprising the extent, population and production of the South, would require a large amount of manufactures, a great deal of shipping, and a large supply of capital. Is it to be supposed that, with the premium of monopoly, there can be no such interests created within the South? Are there no men who would immigrate to a country which offered such reward to their enterprise? Are there no "dough-faces,"—none of those Northern politicians,—“who assure their fellow citizens that safety and prosperity are indissolubly connected with the maintenance of the Union?” Are there none indifferent to particular institutions of property, and only intent upon carrying their enterprise and capital to the best

market? Is the race of men who came from the North to occupy New Orleans; who animate the commerce of Savannah and Charleston; who employ the waterfalls, and govern the spindles of Georgia and Carolina, Alabama and Virginia; would all these be restrained by a decree against emigration, or a prejudice against a section? If they were, is it possible that Europe would send no artisans into a State which offered inducement? Nay, more, is it possible that a people of the same race with those of the North, would prove themselves incompetent to organize industrial systems, necessary, at least, for the supply of their own State? We answer that in common sense, when the South offered the protection of a revenue—perhaps of a protective duty; when it presented cheap supplies, a comfortable and salubrious climate; when it gave access to surrounding consumers without freight or factorage, men would be found to disregard any prejudice of race or institution, and flock to the exclusive advantages which would be offered them. Nor are we reasoning upon theory. Let us take one example. The city of Baltimore is on the threshold of the South; and, as we have shown, indissolubly connected with its destinies. It is destined to be one of the chief manufacturing cities upon the continent. It has acquired a population of two hundred thousand. It is very well known that a large proportion of those people are immigrants from the Northern States and from Europe.

They have come to reside within a slave-holding State because they could thereby better their condition. They came with no intent to hold slaves nor to anathematize the institution. They love the great Protestant principle that every man has the right of private judgment upon a moral question affecting his own salvation, and that he is saved or damned individually, not vicariously, nor do they consider themselves more responsible for any immorality which may attach to the institution of slavery than for any other opinion which may have been adopted by the majority of the people of the States into which they may have come. There are many of



these people Quakers, a sect whose fundamental doctrines forbid slavery, yet we have no instance in which they have made it a point of conscience to invalidate the title to the property of others. The fact of living in a community with slave-holders no more makes a man morally responsible for the institution of slavery, than mustering in the same ranks or contributing to the same tax with a Jew, makes him responsible for the crucifixion. Every phase of human faith may be protected by law, and any peculiarity of actual title may be recognized in the same manner. Nor does it in either case involve a moral wrong in the citizen to obey these laws. As a member of society he has agreed in advance that the enactments of the majority, fairly announced, and fully adjudicated shall be the law of the land. He is then no more morally responsible for the measures of that majority than were the primitive Christians for the pantheism of Rome. We give this as a train of reasoning which convinces men that they commit no crime or inconsistency in becoming citizens of a slave-holding community. Under the great impulse of interest to which we have adverted, we should anticipate the influx of capital, and skill, under the obvious argument which we have stated we should apprehend no obstacle from a difference of opinion in regard to the morality or advantage of a particular title.

We have endeavored to make our argument as calm and as clear as our capacity permits, and we now repeat to those who have accompanied us, the question, whether the North or South has most of pecuniary loss to apprehend from the dissolution of the Union? Let us post up the comparison. The South would lose the companionship and protection of a nation which despises, and under the obligations of a fraternal compact, would slander her abroad and destroy her at home. She may lose also a market for a portion of her staples. The North would lose the present home market for her manufactures, or be compelled to pay an equal duty with other nations to employ it. In this view the South would be most independent, because she makes a supply of provisions for her own population, and produces certain staples which the world

must buy, because no one else can produce them to the same advantage.

But it was just contended by the author of the North and the South, that the Union was dishonorable to the North, because the South dictated its policy. Next, that the North derived only small pecuniary advantages from its continuance; that the "Southern trade could be even replaced by that of Canada, Brazil, China, and St. Domingo."\* The same insidious sophistry is continued. It is charged that:—

*The expenditures of the Union have been chiefly incurred for the aggrandizement of the South.*

The following is the specification: "The expenditures of the Government were raised from eight to twenty-two millions, because the object of that increase was the extirpation of the few and poor Seminoles, whose occupation interfered with the enlargement of the field for slave labor."

This argument is prefaced by an unsound aphorism. "The policy of the North looks homeward;" "Southern policy looks outward;" "Northern men seek no enlargement of territory, but they desire to render productive what they have." "Southern men seek additions to their territory, but they do not desire to make productive what they have." Now a people who are dependent upon commerce with others, would, we suppose, "look outward," and such, not to repeat what we have said, has been the policy of the North. We have shown that our earlier acquisitions of territory were by Northern and Western men. The commercial policy of the government "looks outward," as well as "homeward." The wars with England and Tripoli were for commercial protection. The Japan expedition is undertaken for the increase of our commerce; all these "look outward." Upon the question of aggrandizement, we may add that Virginia, a Southern State, gave up to the North her western domain, and even accompanied the action with a condition which disqualified them from joining the same political category with herself.

\* Sir N. Wraxall has said "that the trade of the Chesapeake was well exchanged for that of the Ganges."

Yet the author repeats, the proof of Federal partiality, "Louisiana was purchased chiefly for the South."

We cannot argue the question that the Seminole war was to enlarge the field of Slave labor. The Seminoles lived in the Everglades. They were as inaccessible as alligators; the fewer there were, the harder they were to extirpate. Neither cotton nor sugar could be planted to any exclusive advantage in their country. At the precise date of that war, the Southern Atlantic Slave States were pouring their immigration into Alabama, Georgia, Mississippi and Louisiana, States in which land was cheap, the Cotton crop certain, markets accessible, and very few Indians. There was no immigrant movement to Florida, then, nor until long afterwards.

The Florida war was fought for the same cause with that by which the Virginia militia, at the battle of the Kanawha, gained the whole North-western Territory, for the same cause which occasioned the expedition of Wayne, or led the Kentuckians to the River Raisin, or which carried on the Black Hawk war. The defence of the frontiers, and the acquisition of Indian Territory.

"Under Mr. Van Buren,"—a Northern President,—“the expenditures were increased to thirty millions,” under Mr. Polk, “to forty-five millions.” All this is charged to the same cause, and the North is reminded of the improvements which it could have made, and the spoliation bill which it defeated, as the Israelites were told of the meat which they might have continued to eat “to the full.” All this is but the catch-word of a campaign argument against the South, for which it really seems this work has been prepared. In the days of party conflict, it was usual to charge this increase of expenditures rather to party than sectional account, and this was demonstrated at least to the satisfaction of Mr. Van Buren’s and Polk’s opponents. We have seen statements to show that the Anti-internal improvement party had bestowed more upon that cause than its friends had done. At least, we are surprised at the effrontery which charges the expenses of the Navy and Army upon the South. To such arguments, reply

is unnecessary. The war of Mr. Polk has given half a million of gold per week to New York, and his free trade policy is charged with having enlarged the Federal revenues immensely.

"But," continues our author, "the Federal expenditure seems now to be fixed at from forty to fifty millions of dollars, exclusive of contracts for mail Steamers requiring more than twenty." We cannot analyze the expenditures, nor assess them upon each section respectively. We believe it has been shown that for what cause soever, the revenues may have been levied, very little of them are paid into the Southern States. We presume, then, they are to be charged to the belligerent propensities of the South, upon the expressive aphorism, that "the South looks outward," and upon this general assumption, this extraordinary reasoner goes on to prove "*The superior economy of a Northern confederacy.*" This is based upon the pacific policy of the North, which "looks inward," and "has but little use for a Navy." Taxation might be reduced, because of the superior intelligence of the Northern people. Diplomacy would be cheap, "for we have nothing to ask for, and nothing for which we would fight." Very pacific! Would they not fight for the liberation of the Slaves? The result of this economical calculation is, that an additional saving of perhaps forty cents per poll might be effected, an argument conclusive of the question, unless we could demonstrate that the believer in this doctrine could make more than eighty cents by remaining in the Union, or unless the South would consent to pay a bonus equal to that sum, for the society of their "loving cousins." But the argument is carried into the future, and the Union is to be dissolved to avoid embarrassments to come. These are to result from the purchase of Cuba, and perhaps of other territory, and as "*The North is paying many millions of dollars annually, for the enlargement of Slave territory; this will end in re-establishing the infamous trade by which Africa was so long degraded and depopulated.*" This is a singular argument upon a great proposition of national existence. The Union should be dissolved. 1. Because of the political dishonor of Southern association. 2. Because it would save forty



cents a head. 3. Because the North may be bound for bad bargains. 4. Because the North will only lose forty cents a head by dissolution. 5. Because the Slave trade may be re-opened. We may almost hope when the pamphleteer shall see such a collocation of the reasons for sacrificing our Federal inheritance, he will collect and cancel a publication whose insidious malevolence has been defeated by its unsound and futile argument. In connection with the purchase of Cuba, he has given us a somewhat startling display of all the money paid for education in the United States. This we are told in italics, is less than the interest on the purchase money of our territory and the unlucky war of the Everglades. Well, we do not hesitate to admit that "a buff jerkin is a most excellent robe of durance," but what greater connection there can be between the relative cost of land and learning, than there would be between the comparative mortality of war and the cholera, we cannot imagine. Still, lest any should be deluded into jumping out of the window, for fear the house may take fire, we will argue the improbability that the Slave trade will be re-opened to "the degradation of Africa." In this we shall find the "North and the South" to resemble the beneficent domain of nature, in which, though venomous reptiles may abound, there is yet an antidotal argument, which neutralizes and disarms their venom. The slave trade was carried on by England, under the Asiento and other contracts. New England conducted the same business to the extent that the slave-holding colonies could pay in money and commerce. By constitutional agreement this trade was prohibited, the slave-holding States being then in the majority. This law has been always considered protective in its effects. The author of the "North and the South" avows himself a protectionist. He will admit that if a merchant or manufacturer holds a stock of goods, and the duty shall afterwards be increased upon the articles which constitute their assortment, the merchant or manufacturer would naturally oppose the repeal of the duties as injurious to their interests.

Thus at another place, in which he wishes to taunt Virginia with the production of slaves for sale—

"The people of Virginia," the author says, "*whose chief manufacture is that of negroes for exportation*, and who are protected in this department of trade by an absolute prohibition of all competition from abroad. This prohibition they have always regarded as constitutional, because it enables them to sell negroes at a thousand dollars that might be imported from the Coast of Africa for a hundred."—page 24.

\* \* \* \* \*

"Of all the States of the Union, Virginia is the one that is most dependent upon the protection afforded by the North through the intervention of the Federal Government—and yet it is the most determined against permitting interference with what it calls freedom of trade. It has but one branch of manufacture fairly established within its limits, and that is of negroes for exportation, in which it is protected by an absolute *prohibition* of foreign competition, by aid of which it sells a negro for a thousand dollars, while similar ones could be imported from the coast of Africa at less than one-fifth that price."—p. 37.

Is it probable then that the interest of the older Atlantic States, would be in favor of re-opening the slave trade? and with or without their consent could it be done? Let us make it yet more plain. Slave-holders have \$1500,000,000 invested in slaves. This value depends greatly upon the positive scarcity of slave labor. Is it probable that they would introduce more slaves in competition with their own? do they wish the same value in more lives, subject to more risk; attended with more expense? Would those who own no slaves desire to increase the number, or reduce the taxable values, bring new hands into competition with their own, or increase the danger of insurrection? Certainly not. It would not then be the interest of the slave owner to prostrate the protection of the anti-slave trade treaties, and the anti-slave trade law. But if it were, how could the slave-trader carry his particular scheme without the assent of that North, which we are told is so much more intelligent, populous, and wealthy, and so committed against slavery, that it will tolerate no increase of its present extent. It is unnecessary to mention that it would involve a reversal of the policy of Europe for the interest of a limited section. We must then insist that the author of

the work under review is either an extremely timid person himself, or supposes his readers to be easily alarmed by phantoms which they have not the boldness to examine. A system of argument thus addressed to the parsimony and cowardice of a people is too openly contemptuous in its inferences, to be successful.

The work contains an appeal to the supposed jealousy between the masses who produce manufactures, and the planters who furnish staples in exchange for their work and payment of their wages—which we will proceed to notice. It is objected that the protective system has not received the support of the Southern people. The political tradition is that Mr. Calhoun in the outset supported the tariff. It is certain that Mr. Clay always carried Kentucky in favor of it. There has been always a large Whig vote given in the South for the protective system. If the protection of manufacturing labor was regarded as antagonistical to slave labor, it is plain that the immense interest in the latter investment which Southern Whigs represent would have prevented them from sacrificing their property to a measure of abstract policy. On the other hand, Massachusetts violently opposed the earlier tariffs. But the argument in the South has always been that manufacturers create a demand for Southern staples, and an ability to pay for other Southern products. Besides that increased competition thus generated reduces the cost of the manufactured article to the South. There can be no conceivable hostility between these interests. The ingenious author, however, says that Southern policy broke down the protective system, and thus sacrificed an immense amount of Northern capital. We do not understand this. If this be a question of sectional interest, why is it that the North, with its numerical supremacy, does not adopt a protective tariff? and if she will not, why reproach the South with having prevented it?

If the caprice of the South can destroy so much value, why speak of the dependence of the South upon the North? The North cannot inflict such an injury upon the interests

of the South. The latter, then, is, in this particular, less dependent upon the advantages of the Union than the former. We have shown that the Whigs of the South have given the most disinterested support to the protective system. The opposition to the Tariff was always based upon the charge, that an unfair bounty was given to the labor of one section at the cost of the other. This charge was denied; for, if it could be demonstrated any where that one class of people were subjected to an excessive tax, it would be unconstitutional. It was never objected that there was any antagonism between unprotected interests. The Northern conviction must either be, that the tariff was an excessive contribution by one section, for the benefit of another, or not. If it be, would the author exact it? If it be not, then the objections could not have been to any antagonism of interests which did not exist.

We deny, then, that the opposition of the South to the tariff arose from the belief, "which the buyers of labor entertain, in the enslavement of the laborer."

"The growing demand for provisions and staples was, it seems, stopped by the repeal of the Tariff." This shows the superior dependence of the North on the Union.

But the cry arose throughout the North, "Give me work! Only give me work! Make your own terms! My wife and family have nothing to eat!" \*

Here is a lamentable acknowledgment of Northern dependence. We never heard such cries in the South; no such want was ever known in that section. How can the North be independent; how can it dare to throw off its political connection, when the bread of its people depends upon the artificial action of its government? Rich such States may be. But it is the riches of the San Francisco or Arctic, liable to be destroyed by the casualty of an instant. We will not reargue the Tariff question, but we cannot admit that

\* We regret that this cry is repeated with increased intensity. Yet, whilst the North is one scene of industrial prostration, the agricultural condition of the South was never more sound. The market price of Negroes and United States "sixes" is the best indication of the stability of both "institutions." We are glad to see them comparatively unaffected by the pressure.



Mr. Van Buren, and Mr. Pierce, would have vetoed a bill to promote the interest of their section. The idea that "the Tariff is a conflict between free and slave labor," is too novel to repeat. And, as if to refute this very position, the author devotes a chapter to the proposition, that the protective system promotes the interests of the South, we deem it unnecessary to do more than to refer the charge to the reply.

*Slavery has caused the difference in wealth and numbers between the North and South.*

In citing the proofs of Northern superiority, the author attributes to the South another opinion, for which he has no warrant in the action or avowal of that section. That opinion is, that this superiority is "all due to the action of the Federal Government."

The difference between the political power and commercial wealth of the two sections, is due to other causes. The Northern States were compelled to resort to pursuits which encourage large aggregations of people. The Southern States remain content with the single pursuit of agriculture. Thirty years ago DeWitt Clinton founded—in the face of an opposition that should for ever disgrace the memory of those who waged it—a system of internal communication which opened the territory of the West to the cities of the North. New York sprung into the Emporium of the union. Other Northern States have adopted the same policy, and Philadelphia and Boston and Baltimore have emulated her prosperity. Thirty years ago manufactures were successfully planted in the East. Villages and cities sprung up throughout the country. An immense home market was cordially opened by the South. These pursuits encouraged density of population. The commerce which accompanied them generated wealth. The Southern States confined themselves to a single pursuit, they opened no canals, they constructed no Railroads, they lived content with what they possessed. But a system of insult and encroachments appeared in the North. It was then perceived that the South suffered loss from the employment of Northern agencies which they could just as

well save by introducing the same pursuits at home. Southern men began to observe that the Northern States were invoking the censure of the whole world upon the home institutions of the South. They knew that a day might come when it would no more do to go to New England for bayonets and blankets than it had been to go to old England for the same indispensable articles. It was then that a Remedial School arose up in the South which copied the industrial improvements of the North. They introduced systems of education, encouraged Southern manufactures, and opened Southern mines. They presented a system of Railroads which have added even more than annexation to their territory. They have studied the resources of the South and found that it possesses every attribute necessary to an independent and prosperous empire. Already have the influences of its system been most happy, a practical spirit is diffusing itself throughout the South. Emigration from the Southern Atlantic States has ceased, and immigration has rapidly succeeded. Their young men are employed in agriculture and the arts. Labor is honorable. Temperance is cherished. Vice and dissipation almost unknown. Under the system of progress the South is calm, confident, and fearless—*paratus in utroque*—to continue the copartnery, if treated with justice and cordiality, to establish the most powerful and comprehensive empire if she be driven to it. But the system of development contributes to her means of defence. When it has been seen that from a kind and devoted friend she can become a formidable rival and a troublesome foe, both the patriotism and prudence of the North have hastened to put down the mushroom fanatics who would destroy the fairest form of human government. The present is propitious to the independence of the South. She is regarded as more industrious, more temperate, more practical, capable of great effort, possessing abundant revenue. The South is respected accordingly by those whose opinions are of value to her. We think the indications favorable to a restoration of harmony, and the acknowledgment of Southern rights. If they be not, every

day adds to Southern ability to meet any emergencies. Thus stands the South, prepared to extend her hand with the open sincerity of childhood, or clenched with the weapon of defiance.

We take our leave of the author. We cannot pursue the unfair insinuations of malevolence with which the work abounds, without wasting space adapted to something better. The stigma that nearly half the United States is engaged in rearing slaves like cattle for sale, the imputations of pride, ignorance and vice cast upon the whole people of the South, would not be applied by the author to any individual who belongs to that section. It is in the wantonness of anonymous impunity sent abroad to bring pain and shame upon those over whom he can have no control and for whom he incurs no responsibility. We shall not follow his example and insult a whole people in return. It would show neither the impulse of courage nor a sense of justice. The people of the North will find an argument in the work under consideration addressed to their interest, and advocated by their fears. They are told that the Union is worth to them forty cents each. Upon the subscription of the paltry sum involved, they can be absolved from the responsibility of an institution said by the author to be very immoral. If such an appeal should be unsuccessful, their morality cannot be worth a tax of forty cents a head. The people of the North will despise a demonstration of their duty, admitted to depend upon a calculation of their interest.

We remember the divine inquiry, "what will a man give in exchange for his soul?" and in the same spirit we ask ourselves, "what would a man take in exchange for his liberties?" Believing that the Federal Union may still be preserved upon terms consistent with the honor of the States which compose it, we would not sell our interest in it for any money demonstration, if, with the author of disunion in disguise, we deemed it dishonorable in its associations, unjust in its policy, oppressive in its exactions, we could not for any pecuniary consideration consent to its continuance.

## ART. II.—BLUNDERS OF HALLAM'S MIDDLE AGES.

1. *Supplemental Notes to the View of Europe in the Middle Ages.* By HENRY HALLAM. London, John Murray, Albermarl street; 1840, 8vo.
2. *View of the state of Europe during the Middle Ages.* By HENRY HALLAM. Ninth Edition. London, John Murray, 1846. 2 vols., 8vo.

There may be a later edition of Mr. Hallam's History of the Middle Ages, than the Ninth, which we have specified in our rubric; but that number of editions would be sufficient to prove, if other and more direct evidence were wanting, that it had definitely taken its place in our libraries as a work of standard authority, and amongst the trade as one of the regular stock books. Its position may not be permanently assured, but it is fixed for the present. It is habitually regarded, and is sometimes read as a satisfactory exposition of the changes, the progress and the characteristics of mediæval times. It may thus appear both too late and too perilous to question its claims to the position accorded to it; and yet, it can never be too late to expose error, nor is that risk to be avoided, which is encountered in the cause of truth. It has been our settled intention, since the publication of this Supplementary volume, to bring to the examination and castigation of this accredited history of the Middle Ages the scanty and fragmentary information of that period, gathered in the course of our reading: for though perfectly aware of the insufficiency of our knowledge for a connected delineation of this important period, or even for the thorough detection and rectification of the numerous errors contained in the volumes under review, we feel equally assured that a limited acquaintance with the subject was competent to the exposure of Mr. Hallam's multifarious blunders, and in many instances to their correction. The mass of notes now before us, in which we have exhibited, criticised, explained or cor-



rected only the more glaring mistakes, is so ample that we can incorporate but a very small portion of them in this notice. What we give from our gleanings will only afford a sample of the ample harvest which more diligent and learned industry might have obtained from the same field.

The labor, therefore, on which we are about to enter, may be tardy, but it is rendered the more necessary by not having been performed before; and if imperfectly executed even now, it may perhaps serve to shake the undeserved and misplaced confidence bestowed upon a book entitled to no such consideration; and may also awaken more profound inquiry into the extent of the errors which have been credulously believed, and into the whole character of those ages which have been so grossly misconceived, in consequence of the ignorant misrepresentations which have been hitherto current in our language.

"Thirty years have elapsed," said Mr. Hallam in the preface to his Supplemental Notes, "since the publication of the work to which the following Notes relate, and almost forty since the first chapter and part of the second were written. In the meantime, however, the long period of the Middle Ages had been investigated by many of my distinguished contemporaries with signal success, and I have been anxious to bring down my own volumes nearer to the boundaries of the historic domain, as it has been enlarged in our own age. My object has been, accordingly, to reconsider those portions of this work which relate to subjects discussed by eminent writers since its publication, to illustrate and enlarge some passages which have been imperfectly or obscurely treated, and to acknowledge my own errors." The pith and marrow of this vague explanation lie in the last member of the last sentence. The confession of former error is the main object of his later work; and without waiting as long as Mr. Hallam waited, before commencing the labor of correction, we shall take advantage of his discharge of a very necessary duty to reconsider the defective parts of a production, which, in default of a better, has become classical; to estimate the

extent of his errors, acknowledged or unperceived; and to examine briefly the value of those amplifications and corrections, which he has presented to the public as giving some appearance of perfection to his earliest undertaking of any magnitude. These Supplemental Notes, issued at the close of Mr. Hallam's long life, may be regarded as giving to his principal work a definitive form, and as purifying it for the acceptance of posterity, while they justify, write, and almost exact a renewed criticism of its most glaring defects. Had we been consulted, however, before their publication, we might have suggested a more thorough, expeditious, economical, and satisfactory method of attaining the same and by simply adding on the last page of his original work, *Corrigendum*. Dele from Vol. I, p. 1, to Vol. II, p. 560.

Mr. Hallam's work on the Middle Ages has been already censured with much and just severity by many subsequent writers, who have enjoyed the opportunity of penetrating into the obscurities of that interesting but carelessly studied period of history. The late Mr. Legare, with most effective and well merited sarcasm, castigated the pretensions of an essay on Mediæval times, which affected to ignore the past influence and enduring importance of the Roman Law, and was grossly ignorant of the modern condition of that extensive branch of learning. We have, ourselves, on several previous occasions spoken of Mr. Hallam's labors in stronger terms of depreciation than we deem it proper to repeat; when instead of a passing animadversion, we have the opportunity of examining somewhat in detail the defects of one of his principal works. We are not disposed to cancel or modify any thing we may have heretofore said on the subject; for scarcely any rebuke would be too harsh for such slovenly investigations. We used strong language before, because we were compelled to compress our judgment into a sentence or a paragraph, without having the time to introduce the qualifications and modifications of the censure which might be appropriate in a more extended notice; and we were anxious, as we still are, to protest against the acceptance of Mr. Hal-

lam's Historical Sketch of the Middle Ages as an ultimate authority in regard to the times and subjects which it so superficially and inaccurately represents. Engaging, as we now do, in a more detailed investigation, and a more extended criticism, and taking up the work to examine it chapter by chapter, and sometimes note by note, we shall purposely refrain from such sweeping condemnation and denunciation, as is not directly provoked by the blunders under consideration, and justified by the evidence adduced. As far as may be practicable, we shall leave our readers to form their own estimate of Mr. Hallam's performance from the results to which our inquiries may bring us. We shall state our objections in orderly succession, as they are suggested by the context of Mr. Hallam's volumes, and shall support them by such proof as is accessible to us; but at the same time, when the chance is presented, we shall candidly admit and exhibit the merits which they may actually possess.

Although contemplating a methodical exposition of such errors as we may be able to detect, as far as our limits may permit, we have no design of writing a formal essay on a book which has been so long before the public, but must content ourselves with simply taking the questionable passages as they occur, and appending our own criticism thereon. Thus we shall insure greater brevity of statement, and imitate the example of the author under review. Indeed, any other course is precluded by the objects of this notice, and by the endless blunders which require reprehension.

Before commencing this detail, however, it may be appropriate to remark that the whole work appears to have been originally undertaken with an inadequate conception of both the nature of the subject, and the duties of the historian. It was perfectly justifiable in Mr. Hallam to limit his labors as he thought proper, but they should have been complete and thorough within the prescribed range. It is not a legitimate objection that he proposed merely his composition of a sketch and not a history. But it is censurable that he should have made his sketch only a series of disconnected outlines—

that he should have given fragmentary delineations of arbitrarily selected topics, and should have omitted every thing which did not suit his tastes, or was not illustrated by the loose collections of his note books. He is fairly obnoxious to blame for the absence of any true spirit of philosophy in his historical inquiries,—for the want of any enlarged appreciation of either the significance or the relations of the periods which he discusses—and for the inadequacy of his learning and his industry for the great task upon which he had ventured. Throughout the work there are numerous marks of haste, slovenliness, ignorance, disregard of the duties and responsibilities of an historian, and narrowness of view.

Of course, it would be unjust to try Mr. Hallam by reference to the discoveries which have been made in regard to mediæval times by subsequent explorers, unless their discoveries were attainable by himself by ordinary diligence and a proper examination of authorities then accessible. But this benevolent rule will not cover his offences, when they have been unnoticed or repeated in his Supplemental Notes, nor will it extend to any new blunders he may have committed. We shall endeavor to bear in mind this plea in mitigation of his guilt, but it will rarely affect the justice of the general censure just expressed.

With this general censure, which is abundantly confirmed by the necessity for the corrections contained in the supplementary volume, by their character, and still more by their new errors, and the evident anxiety to gloss over and conceal the extent and magnitude of the blunders which are confessed, we proceed to examine the mistakes which still remain, notwithstanding the tardy and insufficient effort at amendment. The principal inducement to our undertaking is, indeed, that the redress offered magnifies rather than expiates the crimes committed, and that it is an avoidance in almost all cases even more than it is a confession. Criticism would have been completely disarmed if these Notes had been the simple, candid, humble confession of Mr. Hallam, in his old age, of his faults into which he had been betrayed by the haste and incompetency of his youth.

Mr. Hallam commences his work with the bare statement of the



final overthrow of the Roman dominion in the West, and the establishment of Clovis and the Franks in Gaul. The condition of the population at that time, among the conquerors as among the conquered, does not engage his attention. This defect is, indeed, very largely but not sufficiently supplied by Guizot. But in addition to this, in order that we may adequately understand the true state of Europe in the Middle Ages, we must first be apprized of the nature of the then existing institutions, feelings, cultures, associations and customs, which, by their union, furnished the recipient rudiments of mediæval civilization. In order to acquire this information we must trace the previous career of both the Roman and barbarian elements of the new system. Guizot has done this, perhaps as far as it could be done, in the case of the Germanic races; but the gradual decay of the Roman empire in the West, especially in relation to society and domestic life, has never been properly represented, not even by Gibbon, the brevity and complexion of whose work confined him too much to public events, and the successions of political and ecclesiastical change. Robertson's Introduction to his History of Charles V has always been highly commended, but it has been regarded by others, as well as by himself, as somewhat independent of his main subject. On the contrary, it is a necessary introduction. We could have no sufficient comprehension of the History itself, without this indispensable preliminary. It is true that this necessity is not a little concealed by the fact that Robertson has by no means executed his History of Charles V in the same spirit of comprehensive philosophy which inspired the introductory essay. It is, however, still more important that the history of the Middle Ages, even if composed in a brief and argumentative style, should be preceded by an explanation of the condition in which the elements of social organization were at the time when their fusion commenced, and also of the circumstances which had induced, and the phenomena which attended that condition—for the tendencies are more significant even than the condition, and there is every imaginable difference between a sinking and a rising civilization. The absence of any such preparation in Mr. Hallam's work is a great blemish, and precludes any satisfactory discernment of the actual condition of the populations of France under

the earlier Merovingian kings, and the first periods of Teutonic invasion. The consequences of this omission are still more grievously felt in regard to the history of Italy. The very form in which the treatise is cast—a series of disconnected or loosely connected dissertations—renders this oversight inexcusable, because there is no symmetry of outline which could have been marred by any preliminary disquisition, a rupture, which might have afforded some apology, though an insufficient one, if it had been a formal and methodical history. The mistakes, inconsistencies, and vacillation, which in part result from this unpardonable omission, will frequently render themselves apparent in the future progress of this examination.

The Armorican republic presents the earliest difficulties to Mr. Hallam, is a stumbling block to him at the threshold, and offers the first opportunity for the exhibition of the insufficiency of his learning and researches.\* In the note appended to the original text, he had alleged that DuBos had raised the supposition of an Armorican republic “upon very slight historical evidence;” in the Supplement he acknowledges that the evidence was not so slight as he had pretended; but he stumbles about in his additional elucidations, not merely without arriving at certainty, which is perhaps unattainable, but without appreciating either the significance or the force of the testimonies adduced. The two authorities cited in the Supplement are Zosimus and Procopius, but both are apparently taken at second hand, for there is no reference to the places where the passages are to be found—a looseness of procedure observable in other parts of Mr. Hallam’s labors. We will first consider the reference to Procopius, about whose testimony the most difficulty and uncertainty exist. The Arborychi of Procopius† are assuredly not the Armoricans of the supposed Western Republic, but neither are they considered by him as the inhabitants of the whole of Northern Gaul, as Mr. Hallam imagines. Procopius states that the Franks, who had formerly been called Germans, possessed the marshy country along the Rhine; that the Arborychi were situated next to them,‡ and towards the

\* Hist. Mid. Ages, vol. i, p. 2. Supplement, note 1, p. 1.

† De Bello Gothico, lib. i, c. xii. Vol. ii, p. 63-4. Ed. Bonn.

‡ Τούτων ἐχόμενοι Ἀρβυρυχοὶ ὠκύν.

East of the latter, the Thuringians;\* that the Burgundians were settled to the south of the Thuringians, beyond whom (the Thuringians) were the Suabians and Alemanni. According to the context, then, the Arborychi and the other tribes enumerated, lay to the eastward of the Franks and of the Rhine. The geographical description is precise and unmistakable, and absolutely excludes the notion entertained by Hallam, that he contemplated all the inhabitants at least of Northern Gaul, for it places all the nations mentioned, except the Franks, beyond the limits of Gaul. At the same time, it becomes utterly impossible to identify the Arborychi with the Armoricans of the West, as known to Cæsar, and suspected in after times. They might possibly have occupied a portion of what now forms the Rhenish principalities of Prussia, but no part of Gaul, in the estimation of Procopius. There is no ambiguity in the language of the Byzantine historian, notwithstanding Mr. Hallam's asseveration to that effect. But granting that his acquaintance with the history and geography of Germanic people was confused and inaccurate, we must have some more legitimate basis than his alleged ignorance or obscurity for the conjecture that the Arborychi were either the Armoricans of the West, or the inhabitants of Northern Gaul. Moreover, Procopius is, in the passage under discussion, explaining how the Franks originally obtained a settlement in Gaul, and consequently speaks of them and the adjoining tribes as they existed anterior to the conquest. If Mr. Hallam had explored all the difficulties of the question, and diligently examined the original authorities for himself, instead of caviling conjecturally at isolated passages, he might have found some reason for suspecting the Arborychi of Procopius of being identical with the Chamavi of Zosimus, who were overpowered by Julian.† He would have discovered their abode not in Northern Gaul, but to the eastward of that region described by Tasso.

Seguia la gente por candida e bionda,  
 Che tra i Franchi é i Germani e 'l mar si giace,  
 Ove la Mosa ed ove il Reno nionda,  
 Terra di viade e d'animai ferace. ‡

\* Μετα σε αυτους ες τα προς ανισχοντα ηλιον θοριγγοι βαρβαροι. κ. τ. λ.

† Zosim. lib. iii, c. vi, vii, pp. 130-3. Ed. Bonn, lib. iii, c. viii, p. 133; cum Reitemereri Comm. lib. iv, c. xii, p. 186. Amm. Marcell, lib. xvii, c. viii.

‡ Gerus. Lib: Can. 1, st. xliii.

The ambiguities and difficulties in regard to these Arborychi have mainly grown out of the substitution, by Henry Valecius, of *Αρμoryχοι* for *Αρβoryχοι* in the text of Procopius. The new reading is accepted apparently by Gibbon,\* and is not challenged by Guizot or Milman, but has not been adopted by the recension of Dindofe in the Bonn edition. The *Armoricæ Civitates* of Cæsar,† of which Hallam seems entirely unconscious, are undoubtedly Normandy and Bretagne, and may have extended even further to the East and to the South. But what shall be said of the *Aremoricos saltus* of Merobades, of which Mr. Hallam is equally incognizant.

Lustrat Aremoricos jam mitior nicola saltus ;  
Perdedit et mores tellus, adsuetaque sævo  
Crimino quæsitæ silvis celare rapinas  
Discit inexpertes Cererem committere campis  
Cæsareoque diu manus oblectata labori  
Sustinet acceptas nostro sub consule leges ;  
Et quamvis Geticis sulcum confundat aratris,  
Barbara vicinæ refugit consortia gentis.‡

This passage might refer to the colony of Alans and Huns settled by Ætius in Auvergnès, or to a second colony established by him in Further Gaul, according to the suggestion of Gibbon.§ It is evident that it cannot indicate the inhabitants of Brittany, because they had no connection at that time with the Franks on the Rhine ; neither could they be said to have then changed their customs, nor to be Goths. The line,

Barbara vicinæ refugit consortia gentis,

renders it necessary to locate these Armorican woods in the neighborhood of the Teutonic nations beyond the Rhine. The verses of Merobandis, however, refer to a later period than that contemplated by Procopius ; but it should be added that Niebuhr, in his note on the passage quoted, considered the *Aremoricos saltus* to be the same tract of country which has been assigned to the Armorican Republic.|| The whole context, however, relates

\* Hist. Decl. and Fall, c. xxxviii. Note 35, vol. ii, p. 413. Am. Ed. 8vo.

† De Bello Gallico, lib. v, c. liii; lib. vii, c. lxxv; lib. viii, c. xxxi.

‡ Carru. viii. vo. 8-15.

§ Hist. Decl. and Fall, c. xxxv. Notes 8, 9, vol. ii, p. 333, and Prosper Tyro and Sydonius Apollinaris asthero.

|| "igitur aut Armorica ultia Liguim, Gothorum regnum usque ad hunc fluvium porrigebatur."



to the rising kingdom of the Franks; and it would be a much more rational conjecture to suppose that the forest of Ardennes was the region alluded to.

M. Ardillier, in a special disquisition inserted in *L'Art de verifier les Dates*,\* recognizes without suspicion the Armorican confederation; but the whole tenor of his remarks would assign them a position in the east and not in the west of Gaul. The question of their republican organization is not raised by him: he merely declares their independence.

Mr. Hallam seems wholly unaware that Armorica is mentioned in the State Register of the Western Empire. A *Dux Tractus Armoricani* is enumerated among the officers of Gaul, by the *Notitia Dignitatum*,† and under him we find a *Tribunus Cohortis Princæ Novæ Armoricæ Grannona in Littore Saxonica*. We cannot find fault with Mr. Hallam for his unfamiliarity with the confused learning in regard to these localities, and the results dubiously indicated by Bocking in his commentary on this text, because the second volume of his edition of the *Notitia* was only published in 1850. But the expressions used in his *Imperial Blue Book of Rome* indicate on their face, that a military district of Gaul formed part of the general distribution of the empire under the name of Armorica, and that this name had been transferred to different localities from those originally signified by it. *Prima Nova Armorica* certainly is a phrase sufficient to prove that there had been an *Armorica Vetusta* distinct from it:—and the occurrence of one such change, renders intelligible the possible occurrence of other subsequent changes of a like kind, in the shifting policy of the declining empire. Bocking informs us that *Armorican* signifies only maritime, and applies the designation to the northern coast of Gaul,‡ as far eastwardly as the mouth of the Somme.

Supposing this determination of the *Tractus Armoricanus* to be correct, there is no propriety in identifying the Roman demarcation with the local abode of the *Arborychi* of Pro-

\* Vol. v, p. 429, 8vo. First Series.

† C. xxxvi, p. 107.

‡ Annot. ad not. occ. c. xxxvi, p. 818<sup>a</sup>-819,<sup>a</sup> p. 825.

copius, even if they be considered identical with the Armoricans. They might have been driven further to the east, than the political designation had been. There is, therefore, little reason for questioning the geographical accuracy of Procopius in this matter. Indeed, his statement perfectly accords with this explanation, with the indications of the Notitia, and with an incidental contemporary notice, if it may be applied to his Armoricanus. Procopius says that, while the Visigoths were devastating Gaul and Spain, the Arborychia had been soldiers of the Roman empire, but afterwards entered into confederation with the Germans. Among the allies of the Romans at the great defeat of Attila, by Ætius at Chalons, the Armoritiani are mentioned by Jomandes.\* These may or may not have been Armoricans, but their being so would be in remarkable consonance with the statement of Procopius, at which Mr. Hallam cavils. The main point, however, to be noticed is, that Procopius distinctly asserts the Arborychi to have thrown off the yoke of Rome.

The passage in Zosimus,† referred to by Hallam after Dubos, in like manner only implies the independence of Armorica, and in no respect intimates that it was under a republican form of government, though a Teutonic monarchy might well appear a republic to a Byzantine historian. The Armoricans are said to have imitated the Britons in refusing the Roman rule, and establishing a policy to the best of their ability. The Britons had been previously stated to have rendered themselves independent.‡ But Procopius remarks that from that time forward the Britons lived under their own tyrants,§ a very important observation, which, in the opinion of Gibbon, has been too little regarded.|| Hence Zosimus might simply mean that the Armoricans asserted and maintained their independence of Rome, under their own princes, or

\* De Rebus Geticis, c. xxxvi, as he professedly abridges Cassiodorus, he may be considered as contemporary.

† βρεττανους ημμησαμενοι, κατα τον ισον, σφας, ηλευθερωσαν τροπον εκβαλλουσαι μεν τους Ρωμαιοις αρχοντας, ουκειον δε κατ εξωξισαν πολιτευμα καθιστασαι. Zosim. Hist., lib. vi, c. v, p. 322.

‡ In A. D. 407.

§ De Bello Vandalia, lib. i, c. i, vol. ii, p. 318.

|| Hist. Dec. and Fall, c. xxxi, Note 176, v. ii, p. 278, 8vo.

under German rule, without assuming a republican organization.

It is not probable, however, that the Armoricans of Zosimus are the same with those of Procopius; and though we have defended the latter from the aspersions of Mr. Hallam, we may still conceive that the former refers to Britany, the Armorica of Cæsar, even the Britons mentioned by Zosimus, may have been the inhabitants of Bretagne, a view countenanced by the spelling of the name. In this case, the Armoricans would be the neighboring people to the eastward and southward. But Mr. Hallam virtually concedes everything which he doubts or endeavors to deny in regard to this Armorican state, when he admits that Britany was never subject to the Merovingian kings, except sometimes in name, for though he may think that the proofs alleged by Daru, for the existence of a king of Britany, named Conon, early in the fifth century, would throw much doubt on the Armorican republic, he merely falls into a gross mistake of the meaning of Zosimus, from which he might have been protected, if he had been acquainted with the remark cited by us from Procopius.

From this investigation it follows that there is no good reason for accusing Procopius of geographical ignorance in regard to the Arborychi—nor for denying the existence of an independent state or states in Britany and the surrounding country, during the fifth century; that there is no necessity for identifying the Armoricans with the Britons, for regarding them as the inhabitants of all Northern Gaul, or for conceiving them to be the same with the Arborychi of Procopius. Much obscurity may still surround all these topics, but the doubts, as well as the positions of Hallam, are untenable, and arise from an insufficient or unintelligent study of the original texts.

The next point on which Mr. Hallam displays the limited range of his investigations, and his almost entire dependence upon modern authorities, not always of the best stamp, is in regard to the Franks. In his work he had diffidently asserted

the establishment of the Franks on the left bank of the Rhine, before the reign of Clovis; in his appendix, he adduces no additional proof of this conviction, but furnishes some further information in regard to the race, gathered from recent sources.\* He mentions that the Franks do not appear in history till the year A. D. 240. About this period, according to Tillemont and Gibbon,† a new confederacy, by the name of Franks, was formed among some German tribes, which embraced the Sicambri. They were defeated at *Mojentiacum*, *Mentz*, by the emperor *Aurelian*, then military tribune in A. D. 244.‡ In less than twenty years after this time, under the reign of *Gallienus*, the *Francorum gentes* overran Spain, and almost demolished the city of *Tarragona*.||

*Ammianus Marcellinus* speaks of the *Salian* and also of the *Atticarian* Franks by name,§ and shortly after him the former are spoken of as *Salians* by *Eunapius* and *Zosimus*.¶ We find the *Salii* also repeatedly mentioned in the *Notitia Dignitatum* among the soldiers of the empire.\*\* In the time of *Zosimus*, they appear to have occupied the Duchy of *ves*, while some other Frankish tribes were settled on the left bank of the Rhine, they might perhaps have already entered *Brabant*. The troubled fortunes of foreign and domestic war rendered their settlements transient and uncertain, and may account for the discrepancies which occur in the statements of different writers respecting them.

It is possible to trace back the origin of the Franks much further than has usually been done, and to arrive at much more definite and satisfactory conclusions than *Hallam* has thought of establishing.

The *Sicambri* are accounted one of the principal tribes composing the confederation of the Franks. The name of

\* *Hist. Mid. Ages*, v. i, p. 2, and note. Supplement, note 2, p. 3.

† *Decl. and Fall*, c. x, note 70, v. i, p. 144, 8vo. and the notes of *Guizot* and *Milman*.

‡ *Vopisci. Vit. Aureliani*, c. vii.

|| *Aurelius Victor. de Cesaribus*, c. xxxiii.

§ *Ammian. Marcell. lib. xvii*, c. viii, § 3.

¶ *Eunap. Hist.* p. 64, *Ed. Bonn.* *Zosimi Hist. lib. iii*, c. vi, § 7.

\*\* *Not. Dig. Orient*, c. iv, p. 18, 19. *Occident.* c. v, p. 18<sup>a</sup> 19<sup>a</sup> 24.<sup>a</sup> *Ed. Bocking*.



Sicambri is frequently applied by contemporary historians to them; and Menzel, in his history of Germany, distinctly says, "the Salic Franks were anciently the Sicambri." He refers the designation of Franci to the times and speech of Civilis, who addressed the people of Cologne in these memorable words: *liberi inter liberos eritis*. Yet it is more probable that Civilis should have shaped his compliment or his bribe in allusion to an existing designation, than that the appellation of a race should have been borrowed from his rhetoric. Moreover, such an etymology would be inconsistent with the familiar fact that all the Teutonic tribes constantly and prominently prided themselves in being freemen, and through all their dialects preserved this name as a characteristic distinction of their people.\*

Admitting the incorporation of the Sicambri with the Franks, we are enabled to carry back the partial origin, at least of the latter people, and the date of their settlement on the Rhine, to the reign of Augustus. Suetonius informs us that, when the Ubri and Sicambri submitted to that emperor during the prosecution of his German wars, he transplanted them into Gaul, and established them in the country adjacent to the Rhine.† From this period onward, it is not difficult to trace some indications of their fortunes till the name of Franks became familiar to Roman ears. In the reign of Constantius, the Salian Franks were driven out of their settlements between the arms of the Rhine, by the Chamaois, and passed over into Roman Gaul.‡ Here they were found and attacked by Julian,§ who established regiments of Salians and Chamaoi on the Rhenish frontier, where they remained till a late period.|| In the war of Constantine against Licinius, the Franks fought on the side of the former,¶ and they continued for several generations to be

\* Savigny. Hist. Droit Rom. au Moyen age, c. iv, §§ 54-56, v. i, p. 134-159.

† Vit. Octaviani, c. xxv, Vit. Tiberii, c. ix.

‡ Zosimi. Hist. lib. iii, c. vi-vii, p. 130-3.

§ Ammian. Marcellin, lib. xvii. c. viii, §§ 1-3. Julian. Ep. ad Attii, cited by Bocking, p. 552.º

|| Zosimi. Hist. lib. iii, c. viii, p. 133. Vide Reitemereri Comm ad loc.

¶ Amm. Marcell. lib. xv, c. v, § 33.

stipendiaries of the Empire. They were extensively employed in the palace of Constantius, and discharged the same functions as the Scotch Archers and Swiss Guards of the French monarchy.\* Before the Chamaoi drove out the Salian Franks from their settlements, as mentioned above, they had been repulsed by the Franks, who must have been those designated as Atticarian, and prevented from crossing the Rhine in that neighborhood. From these and numerous other indications which could easily be adduced, it would appear that from the times of Constantine to those of Julian, both branches of the Franks had occupied the country beyond the Rhine, and probably on both its banks. The testimonies which we have collected on this point, and with regard to the changes of fortune which attended the early periods of Frank occupancy in Gaul, are too many and too cumbrous to be cited here. Since we took the trouble of their collection, the most of them, with many additional illustrations of the same topic, have been inserted by Bocking in his own elaborate commentary on the *Notitia Occidentalis*.

In addition to what we have remarked about the Franks, we shall only venture to suggest an explanation of the characteristic designations of their two principal tribes—the Salians and the Ripuarians. Both names reveal by their form a Roman origin.† The former was sufficiently familiar to the Latin literature—in place of the latter we usually find Attuarian employed. Is it not possible that the Salians may have derived their name from an early settlement on the river Saale, and that the Attuarians may have been called Ripuarian from their early establishment on the bank (*ripa*) of the Rhine? The name of the *Salii* has been derived from *Sal*, *Salt*, and this etymology is countenanced by very high authorities, and strengthened by the existence of many local designations in that region “having a similar derivation.”‡ Our suggestion is of course conjectural, but it is sustained

\* *Amm. Marcell. lib. xv, c. v, § ii.*

† A special treatise, which we have not seen, has been written in proof of this, by Reinuis Crefeld, 1847.

‡ *Graf. Grimm. and Rem. vide Bocking. Annot. act. Not. Occ. p. 229<sup>o</sup> 962.<sup>o</sup>*

by many considerations, and is particularly confirmed by a passage of Claudian, which has escaped the learned diligence of Bocking.

Tempore tam parvo tot prælia sanguine nullo  
 Perficio, et luna nuper nascente profectus,  
 Ante redis, quam plena fuit, Rhenumque minacem  
 Coribus infractis adeo mitescere cogis,  
 Ut Salius jam rura colat flexosque Sicambri  
 In falcem curvent gladios, gemmasque viator  
 Cum videat ripas, quæ sit Romana requirat:  
 Ut jam trans fluvium non indignante Cauco  
 Pascat Belga pecus, mediumque ingressa per Album  
 Gallica Francorum montes armenta pererrant:  
 Ut procul Hercyniæ per vasta silentia sylvæ  
 Venari tuti liceat, lucosque vetusta  
 Religione truces, et robora numinis instar  
 Barbaria nostræ feriant impune bipennes.\*

In connection with these significant verses, and for the more particular explanation of his term Ripuarian, may be considered the interpretation given by Procopius to Riperian, as applied to Dacia beyond the Danube. He says that it was so called from the Latin *ripa*, which signifies the bank of a stream.† The Romans frequently employed this or an equivalent designation. There was a *Noricum Ripense* and a *Valera Ripensis*, and a part of Southern Gaul lying along the Rhone was called *Gallia Ripariensis*. Many legions too had a similar epithet added to their names,‡ so that to assign to a portion of the Franks, the name of Ripuarian, would have been only the observance of a common practice.

What we have said about the history of the Franks, though lying entirely beyond the reach of Mr. Hallam's researches, affords only a faint specimen of our own scanty gleanings on this subject. We have used but a small portion of our materials, but the little which has been adduced by us may be sufficient to show the very negligent manner in which he has performed his task. The inattention to original authorities, which is so conspicuous in his hurried and unsatisfactory notice of the Franks, and leads to many of his subse-

\*De Landibus Stilichonis. lib. 1, vv. 218-31.

† \* \* \* \* ριπα γὰρ ποχθῃ τη Λασιων καλεται φωνη. Procop. De Addif. lib. iv, c. v, p. 287.

‡ See Bocking's Index to his edition of the *Notitia Dignitatum*.

quent errors, is constantly forced upon our notice; it is significantly manifested in his superficial observations on the theory of Dubos, which he would scarcely have hazarded if he had been acquainted with the early history of the Franks.

This celebrated theory professedly consists in representing Clovis as a sort of lieutenant of the Roman emperors, and as governing the Roman part of his subjects by delegation from the imperial authority; but it virtually extends to the question whether the institutions of the Franks and of other Teutonic nations were of Roman or indigenous origin. This is of course the most important inquiry that the history of mediæval civilization presents. Mr. Hallam admits in his supplement that the doctrines of Dubos have been partly countenanced by Gibbon, and have been lately revived in almost their fullest extent by Sir Francis Palgrave, and he might have added Spence and many continental writers. The endorsement of such names is very strong presumptive evidence of the correctness of those views. Still, we may safely assert that this theory has been sometimes pressed too far by its author. But Hallam is almost entirely one-sided in his speculations, and consequently erroneous, presenting in this respect a striking contrast to the impartiality and comprehensiveness of Guizot.

The barbarian chiefs, who established themselves within the limits of the Roman empire, did so, for the most part, either ostensibly as the lieutenants of the emperor or as their successors by a compulsory concession—almost always, however, with a direct reference to the old established imperial authority, and the ancient customs and constitution of the empire. This is distinctly asserted and exhibited by the Byzantine writers in regard to Odoacer and Theodoric—it is continually and ostentatiously repeated by the latter sovereign in the state papers of Cassiodorus—and it descended as a tradition of the monarchy among the Ostrogoths until their overthrow by Belisarius and Narses.\* There was a general uni-

\* Procopius. *De Bello Gothicæ*, lib. ii, c. vi, vol. ii, p. 169. The passage is important, though unknown to Hallam, as is also Agathius, lib. i, c. v, p. 25



formity among the notions and practices of the several invading tribes: and that which can be proved by direct testimony to have been true of one dynasty, might be assumed to be applicable to the others also, without special evidence, though this is not wanting in regard to the tenure of Clovis, as Mr. Hallam admits. The Teutonic chiefs, who dismembered the Roman territory, always professed and usually fancied that they had been able to maintain the continuity of the empire unbroken: nor will the pretension appear absurd if it be remembered that the emperors and generals, and even statesmen, subsequently to the Antonines, were usually barbarians, of barbaric race like themselves. When this succession to the imperial rule was not avowed or supposed, they called themselves kings of the Franks, Goths, Huns, Vandals, &c., and occupied the lands of the empire, not as a regularly constituted kingdom, but as tributaries or military allies, or in order to obtain subsistence for their followers, or to enforce compensation for past arrears or current services. They habitually regarded themselves in the light of imperial functionaries; and even when they had won for themselves crowns virtually independent of all foreign suzerainty, they sought the consulship, the honors, and the dignities of Rome. This was the case even as late as Charlemagne. The fusion of Roman and Germanic usages, of the imperial and barbarian character, was so gradual, unconscious and complete, that the barbarian princes regarded themselves as a constituent portion of the Roman empire, and religiously observed for some time the formalities and ceremonies of the organization which they were engaged in superseding. We find Theodoricas attentive to the factions of the circus as Justinian, as precise in his directions to hasten an ample supply of the imperial robes of purple as Constantine Porphyrogenitus could be; and a constant correspondence was kept up between the East and West on official transactions, as if they were then members of one household, as they had previously been.\*

\* Cassiodorus. var. i, Ep. ii, xx, xxvii, xxxiii, lib. ii, Ep. i, ii, iii, ix, xxxix, xlv, lib. v, Ep. xlii.

It is a matter of but little consequence, so far as the comprehension of those times is concerned, whether any formal cession of France was ever made to Clovis or his successors. The main point in reality is to determine whether his kingdom was a violent disruption of the Empire in contemporary estimation, or only the intrusion of a turbulent and troublesome usurper of supreme power. The relation of the founders of the Mediæval kingdoms to the Roman empire, may be illustrated by the somewhat analogous relation of Mehemet-Ali, as pacha or viceroy of Egypt, to the Sublime Porte. Of the fact that Roman usages were not violently or arbitrarily supplanted by the establishment of the Teutonic kingdoms, there can be no doubt,\* notwithstanding Mr. Hallam's entire ignorance on this, as on many other topics that lay in his path. Where they disappeared at all, they died out gradually with the lapse of time by a national decay, and scarcely so rapidly or so completely in the Germanic states as under the Byzantine court. Mr. Hallam virtually concedes all that is important in the allegation of Dubos when he says afterwards; "The house of Clovis stood to him (the Roman subject in Gaul) in place of the Cæsars: this part of the theory of Dubos cannot be disputed.† As to that extension of the views of Dubos which represents mediæval civilization as of Roman rather than of German descent, Mr. Hallam is wholly in error when he repudiates it, as there will be future occasions of demonstrating.

Whenever an opportunity is afforded for blundering, Mr Hallam is sure to avail himself promptly of it. And, indeed, there are certain extensive families of error to be found in his work, which deduce their lineage from the same ancestral stock, propagating the infection of negligence, ignorance, and misapprehension through each successive descent. An instance of this is furnished in his intimation that the condition of the people could not have been better under the Teutonic dynasties than under the Roman empire.‡ He does

\* Fauriel. *Hist. de la Poésie Provençale*, chap. v, vol. i, p. 117.

† Hallam, *Supplement*, note 57, p. 85, 6.

‡ *Hist. Mid. Ages*, vol. i, p. 3. *Supplement*, note 5, ii.

not explicitly assert this, for he rarely makes an asseveration in regard to any fact, unless he is totally ignorant on the subject. He only insinuates a doubt when he is too lazy and listless to prosecute arduous researches to a definite result. Now, the whole current of contemporary testimony establishes beyond question that the Roman subjects gained and were conscious of their gain, by a change of masters. Guizot has abundantly proved this by ingenious arguments from indirect evidence; but the naked asseveration is frequently made by the annalists of the times, and proofs of improvement may be discovered in their history. Mr. Hallam himself refers to Salvian and Eucherius in regard to the effects of the ascendancy of the Visigoths and Burgundians; but he endeavors to rebut their testimony by the flippant and sentimental remark that it must have been in itself mortifying to live in subjection to barbarians and heretics; not to mention the *hospitality*, as it was called, which the natives were obliged to exercise towards the invaders, by ceding two-thirds of their lands. Against this implied denial of the fact, we may place the express declarations of the imperial historians. As early as the reign of the elder Severus, we are informed by Herodian,\* that large numbers of mechanics emigrated to the Persian dominion to escape the exactions of their own empire. The same result attended the extortions and persecutions under Justinian.† The condition of the imperial subjects, borne down by iniquitous practices, by unwise legislation, by tyranny, by taxation, and extraordinary exactions, and the numerous advantages acquired by a transfer to barbarian supremacy, are strikingly shown in the remarkable colloquy between the Roman refugee in the camp of Attila, and Priscus, the Roman ambassador, by whom the conversation is reported.‡ It is impossible to read Procopius, or any of the writers who shortly

\* Hist. lib. iii, c. iv, §§ 18-20. cf. Orac. Sibyll. lib. xi, vv. 113-118, vide Tac. Ann. lib. xiv, c. xiv.

† Procopius. Hist. Arc. c. xi, p. 77, c. xxv, p. 142. De Bell. Pers. lib. ii, c. vii, vol. i, p. 185-6, c. xxviii, p. 281.

‡ Under Theodosius II. Excerpta e Prisci Hist. p. 190-5, Ed. Bonn.

preceded or succeeded him, without arriving at the conclusion that the loss incurred by surrendering even two-thirds of their lands to the conquerors was a smaller and less grievous imposition than the regular imposts and uncertain fiscal extortions of the Roman practice. In this point it would be easy to produce incontrovertible proof. The materials have been already gathered by us, and lie before us; and their exhibition would cost only the trouble of transcription, but they would occupy too much space to be written out on the present occasion. Mr. Hallam, instead of slurring over this point—a most important one by the way—with a mere hasty expression of amazement might have profitably investigated it, and discovered the actual condition of the inhabitants of the empire at the time of the Teutonic invasions. Had he done so, his amazement would have been dispelled, and he might have attained to that accurate knowledge of the times which he pretends to characterize, which is now woefully deficient in his history. But we must proceed to other blunders, and treat them with greater brevity, or we shall be unable to furnish even a sample of his mistakes, as the corrections which even our scanty learning and desultory studies can supply, would soon outrun the extent of his supplementary volume.

When he states that the name of *Franci* was always applied to the whole people,—the kings are always *reges Francorum*,\*—he must be understood as referring solely to their domestic historians, and to a period considerably subsequent to Clovis. Anterior to that time, and in Roman usage, the designation was not employed always with this latitude, nor was there such uniformity in the title of their kings. The name of *Franci* was familiar to Ammianus Marcellinus,† who records that King Macrianus perished in France (*Francia*) by the stratagems of Mellobandes, who is afterwards termed *domesticorum comes* and *rex Francorum*.‡ In this case, the *Franci* could scarcely have been intended to

\* Hallam. Supplement: Note 21, p. 36.

† Amm. Marcell. lib. xxx, c. iii, § 7.      ‡ Amm. Marcell. lib. xxxi, c. x, §§ 1-6.



include the Roman population. The appellation, *Francia*, occurs in *Ansonius*.\*

*Accedent vires, quas Francia, quasque Chamaves,  
Germanique tremant; hinc verus habebere lunes.*

And in *Claudian*,†

*Provincia missos,  
Expellet citius fasces, quam Francia reges,  
Quos dederis.*

Mr. Hallam refers the decline of the Christian establishments in the East, towards the close of the Crusades, to the adoption of European arms by the Saracens, as one principal cause, and supposes that the lance and the coat of mail had been borrowed by them from the Latins.‡ This is possible, as the restitution of an ancient loan, but it is not probable. As the history of these parts of armor, offensive and defensive, is curious, we will afford some indications on the subject. Our learned author has apparently no suspicion that their employment, in the East or in the West, was earlier than the Crusades. The lance was in use among the Persians at least as early as the reign of Julian, and might have descended to them from immemorial antiquity. *Ammianus* describes a part of their cavalry as prepared to fight with long poles, and awaiting the onset of the enemy without movement, so that they might be imagined to be held together by brazen bands.§ The employment of the coat of mail was much earlier. *Herodian* accounts for its introduction among the Persians of the frontier, by alleging that it might have been rendered familiar to them by the soldiers of *Niger*, who settled beyond the *Tigris*, on the defeat of their commander by *Severus*|| When *Artabanus* invaded the Roman dominions, after the death of *Caracalla*, he had among his troops soldiers, who fought in coats of mail, with long spears, from the back of camels.¶ The *Rhoxolani* are de-

\* *Idyll. x. Mosella. v. 484.*

† *De Laud. Stilichon. lib. i, v. 236-8.*

‡ *Mid. Ages, vol. i, p. 34, 35.*

§ *Amm. Marcell. lib. xxv, c. i, § 13.*

|| *Herodian, lib. iii, c. iv, §§ 18-20.*

¶ *Herodian, lib. iv, c. xiv, § 6, cf., c. xv, § 4.*

scribed by Tacitus\* as fighting, in the reign of Otho, with lances, (*conti*,) two-handed swords, (such as the Swiss afterwards used,) and body armor made of iron plates, or very hard leather; and this ponderous mail is contrasted with the light equipage of the Romans: (*Romanus miles facili lorica, et missili pilo, aut lanceis assultans.*) The *Cataphractarii* and *Clibanarii*, as these mailed warriors were called, are characteristically described by the Emperors Julian and Ammianus.† If the description given by these writers was not sufficient to establish the general identity of the defensive armor of the Persian soldiers and of the feudal knights, this would be done by the subsequent expression of Ammianus, who applies the metaphor, *terga cataphracta*, to the description of the back of a crocodile.‡ Towards the close of the fourth century, Eunapius speaks of a Roman regiment of *Cataphracti*;§ and numerous bodies of both *Cataphractarii* and *Clibanarii*—though with an indiscernible difference between them—are specified about the same period in the *Notitia Dignitatum*.|| They may therefore be conjectured to have been armed in imitation of either the eastern or northern barbarians with whom the Romans were then engaged in perpetual conflict.

It has been mentioned above that Herodian attributed the introduction of these soldiers among the Persians to Roman refugees. This certainly establishes the fact that they were then employed by the Romans, although it is to be remembered that the force of Niger consisted of the Syrian legions principally. Mr. Merivale has an interesting note on this species of armor, in which he alleges that the Romans were indebted for it to the Parthians.¶ He might have strength-

\* Tac. Hist. lib. i, c. lxxix, cf., Amm. Marcell. lib. xvii, c. xii, § 2.

† Julian Imp. Or. i. Amm. Marcell. lib. xvi, c. x, § 8. These and the other principal passages on the subject are given by Bocking. Annot. ad Not. Dig. p. 186, 187, 291.

‡ Amm. Marcell. lib. xvii, c. xv, § 16.

§ Eunapii. Hist. p. 101. See Joannes Lydus, De Magistrat. lib. i, c. xlvi, for the Sixth Century.

|| See the references in Bocking's Index.

¶ Romans under the Empire, vol. i, p. 505-6.

ened his position by a reference, which he has overlooked, to the speech of Alexander Severus, entered in the journals of the Senate.\* Lipsius discovers the Cataphracti among the Gauls in the reign of Tiberius, by substituting Clibanarios for the unintelligible Crupellarios, which occurs in Tacitus.† We have no more modern edition of Tacitus at hand, to inform us whether this conjecture has been adopted, but we should conceive it hazardous to draw any historical inference from such a conjectural reading, although Lipsius endeavors to confirm his guess by a reference to Nazarius,‡ who mentions Clibanarii among the Taurini. But an earlier notice than this, even if it were established, occurs in the classic authors of Rome. The Cataphracti are spoken of by Sallust, Virgil, Propertius and Livy; always, however, in connection with the armies of the East.§

Enough has been said on this topic to render it perfectly evident that, whether the Persians borrowed lances and mail armor from the Romans, or the Romans, as is more probable, from the Parthians or Sarmatians, both were known to the Orientals and other nations long before the Crusades; and to show that Mr. Hallam is not merely unacquainted with the learning on the subject, but ignorant that there is any learning connected with it. His sciolism in this respect is not, however, more censurable than his flippancy in the next blunder which we shall notice.

In giving credit to Mary of Anjou for having roused the patriotism and energies of Charles VII, after the heroic enterprises of Joan of Arc, he says: || “though I do not know, on what foundation even this rests, it is not unlikely to be true, and, in deference to the sex, let it be undisputed.” Yet, after having in

\* Lámpridii. Vit. Alex. Severi. c. lvi. vide Trebellii Pollionis. Vit. Claudii. c. xvi.

† Tac. Amm. lib. iii, c, xliii, and Lipsius ad. loc. v. Gretseri et Goar Comm. in Coden. Off. C. P. p. 212. Reiskii Comm. ad Constantin. Porphyrog. p. 188-9

‡ Land. Constant. c. xxii.

§ Sall. Fragm. Hist. Virg. Abu. xi. 770, and Serv. ad loc. Propert. iii, xii, 12. Liv. xxxv, xlviii, § xxxvii, xl, § 11. The references are given in the Lexicons of Faccioliati and Andrews.

|| Mid. Ages, vol. i, p. 76, note.

this off-hand manner evaded an historical difficulty, in his Supplement,\* in his note on this very passage, he censures a much more measured and cautious remark of Sismondi, in regard to Agnes Sorel, with the comment, "this is a loose and inconclusive way of reasoning in history." Yet Sismondi is fully sustained by the declaration of the learned authors of *The Art of Verifying Dates*.† But Mr. Hallam does not remember his own previous observation, nor recognize the necessity of correcting his own grosser offence. Whenever a difficulty is encountered by him, which his archæological learning enables him to recognize as such, he slips it by without examination, or glosses it over with some petulant or frivolous expression; but for others, who render themselves less seriously obnoxious to rebuke, he has not the charity which he more frequently needs himself.

In the discussion of the Salic Laws, Mr. Hallam opines that those passages which allude to the Romans as subjects, or to Christianity, could not possibly have been inserted in the code previous to the conversion and successes of Clovis.‡ This is probably true in regard to Christianity, but it is not equally true in regard to its designation of Roman subjects. The Franks, as we have already shown, had seized upon and occupied portions of the Roman empire before Clovis or even Pharamond, and were assuredly sovereign over parts of the old Roman domain and the Roman lieges as early as Constantius Chlorus.§

With similar rashness our diligent and learned antiquarian remarks: || "It is said the Romans sometimes assumed German names, though the contrary never happened." This may possibly have been the case after the regular establishment of the Frank kingdom, but a remarkable instance of such a change is mentioned prior to that time, and other examples might be adduced. Mederich, a prince of the German frontier, had long been retained by the Romans as a hostage in Gaul. During this period he had been initiated into some of the mysteries of the Greeks—(doctus-

\* Supplement, note 40, p. 59.

† *L'Art de Vérifier les Dates*, vol. vi, p. 99, Sec. Series, 8vo.

‡ Supplement, note 54, p. 72.

§ See the Panegyrics of Eumenius cum notis Variorum et Fr: Balduini in the Regent's Ed. || *Amm. Marcell: lib. xvi, c. xii, § 25.*



que arcana quædam Græca)—in consequence of which he changed his son's name from Agenarich to Serapion. Mr. Hallam has never entertained a suspicion of the close connection and interchange of usages which prevailed between the Roman empire and the Teutonic tribes, both before and after the soil of the former was occupied by the latter. For, very soon after the commission of the mistake just corrected, he falls into a much more grievous error of the same kind, and ventures to assert with that complacent confidence which, in the treatment of such questions, can only spring from want of appreciation of the subjects under discussion, that "the barbarous nations of Gaul and Italy were guided by notions very different from those of Rome."\* He could scarcely have been misled in this way, if he had studied Cassiodorus, or read with any care the Valerian Excerpts appended to Ammianus Marcellinus, or the address of the ambassadors of Vitiges to Belisarius. These Ambassadors declare that Theodoric and the Goths, after they had received Italy by concession from the Emperor Zeno, had maintained the laws and constitution in force with no less fidelity than their Roman predecessors, and had introduced neither written nor unwritten law of their own. This was not merely a diplomatic allegation, but is fully substantiated by the State papers of Cassiodorus. It is obviously and utterly inconsistent with Hallam's statement. The truth was the direct opposite of what he has asserted. The German races followed and imitated as closely as they could—often, indeed, even slavishly and apishly—the Roman practices and institutions, maintaining to the utmost extent all prevalent usages, and frequently running into absurdities in their anxiety to repeat the peculiarities of the civilization which they had conquered. The whole spirit, culture, and habits of those times were essentially Roman, debased or improved at Constantinople, as well as at Ravenna or Toulouse, by the influence and tendencies of a rude but free people. There is much more justice in the subsequent declaration, irreconcilable as it is with the original statement, that, "we know how much the Franks themselves,

\* Hallam, *Mid. Ages*, vol. i, p. 100.

and still more their Gaulish subjects, affected to imitate the style of the Roman court.”\* Into such discrepancies is our careful historian beguiled. Yet all these errors might have been avoided, if he had only made himself familiar with the condition of the Romans and the barbarians at the time when the former passed under the dominion of the latter. If any one is desirous of discovering by pleasant reading, instead of tedious study, how profoundly and how long the Frank monarchy was impregnated with a Roman leaven, let him peruse the interesting narrative of the Merovingian Times by Augustin Thieroy.

One blunder necessitates the commission of another, and the original error leads on a long train of dependent aberrations. The Ostrogoths did not, as Mr. Hallam represents,† desert their own usages and adopt the Roman jurisprudence, “in consequence of an earlier settlement in the empire, and advance in civility of manners ;” but rather in consequence of the mode in which that settlement was effected, and probably the paucity of their numbers in comparison with the Roman population. The admission of such a change, no matter by what cause it was determined, militates most seriously against the original assertion of the entire variance of manners between the notions of the Roman subjects and their barbarous conquerors in Gaul and Italy. But the explanation tendered above is itself entirely erroneous. The Franks had been settled on the Roman territory at least from the times of the first Constantine. The Burgundians had established themselves in Gaul, the Vandals in Africa, the Visigoths in Gaul and Spain, before the occupation of Italy by Theodoric, and most of these tribes were earlier civilized than the Ostrogoths. But Theodoric himself had received a thoroughly Roman education at Constantinople, where he had long been a hostage ; he was as much a Roman as the last defenders of the Western empire, Stilicho and Ætius ; he obtained a settlement within the empire by virtue of a special grant from the emperor ; he had filled high offices under the imperial court ; he was a patrician and a consul ; his followers had long served as soldiers of the

\* Hallam, *Mid. Ages*, vol. i, p. 102, note.    † *Mid. Ages*, vol. i, p. 100,

empire in the vicinity of Constantinople; they had marched with him against Odoacer under the pretext of dethroning a tyrant and usurper; and they were finally settled in the central region of Roman civilization, while the other tribes had seized upon frontier provinces, desolated by frequent invasions before their settled occupation. The Ostrogoths conquered a people of comparatively pure Italian blood, while the Franks, at the time of their settlement in Gaul, found on the soil a mixed race, whose elements had been already confounded by ages of civil discord and war, and by the previous conquests of other Teutonic nations, and who had already become semi-barbarian in consequence of more than two centuries of barbarian violence. The difference between the civilization of the conquered populations in Gaul and Italy is shown by the fact that Clovis found it necessary to apply to Theodoric and import from his dominions sun-dials, water clocks, and musicians.\* Theodoric ascended the throne of Augustulus and Odoacer, as their successor, and with the same title as themselves—partly by right of conquest—a right frequently practiced and illustrated in the history of the empire—partly as the vice-regent of the emperor, with ill-defined terms of suzerainty. Clovis occupied the Roman lands mainly as chief of the Franks. The former scarcely altered in any perceptible degree the prevalent organization; while the latter were only able to preserve it in part, in consequence both of his own rudeness and ignorance, and of the savage independence of his immediate followers. Theodoric ascended the throne at the head of an army, somewhat regular and disciplined, which had long obeyed him as its general. Clovis came into his kingdom by domestic treachery and murder, and only as the dubious chief of a wild and free people. But, as if to show that Mr. Hallam has been misled in his conjectural interpretation of the phenomena of history, not by incorrect inferences and mistaken judgment alone, but by pure ignorance, it unfortunately happens that the Roman law was formerly abridged, codified, and promulgated by the Ostrogoths, Visigoths, and Burgundians, within a very few years of each other,

\* Cassiodorus. Var. lib. i, Epp. xlv, xlvi, lib. ii, Epp. xi, lxli.

and that, of these three compilations, the Visigothic was much the fullest and most satisfactory, and made the fewest innovations on the Theodosian original.\*

It is a gross misconception to suppose, as Mr. Hallam does even in his Supplement,† after forty years vouchsafed for studies and investigations, which were never faithfully prosecuted, that the Personal Law, prevalent in the Teutonic kingdoms, was of peculiarly Germanic origin. This, as is well known, was the privilege accorded to the members of each race incorporated in a common kingdom, to elect whether they would live under the jurisdiction of the law appropriate to their nation, or under that of the dominant tribe. The same usage had prevailed at an early period of the Roman republic, was in force in the times of Cicero, and, like the trial by jury *de medietate linguae*, had passed from the Roman to the barbarian law. ‡ St. Paul's appeal to Rome is in part to be explained on the principle of such an election.

Mr. Hallam criticises Meyer, a man of infinitely greater and more accurate learning than himself, for supposing that long hair was at an early period a distinctive mark of family precedence among the Franks, and is in great doubt and trouble to decide whether it might not have equally been the characteristic of "all superior freemen."§ He might have been relieved from his qualms of conscience and horrible perplexities in regard to these points, if he had been familiar with the ancient authorities. That long hair, and especially long front locks, was in a peculiar degree the characteristic of the Frankish kings, is fully apparent from Claudian, and Priscus Panita, and Agathias.|| The first says :

*Ingentia quondam  
Nomina, crinigero flavorties vertice reges.*

By the second, the long hair of the Frankish kings, in the times of Theodosius and Attila, is commemorated from actual and

\* Savigny. *Hist. du Droit Romain au Moyen Age*. vol. i, p. 36-7.

† Supplement, note 58, p. 91.

‡ Cic. *ad Alt.* lib. vi, Ep. i-ii. *Orat. Verrin.* iv, c. xiii. Fr. Balduinus *Jurispr. Mucian.* p. 489-91.

§ Supplement, note 63, p. 110, 111.

|| Claud DeLand. *Stilichon*, lib. i, v. 202. In *Eutrop.* lib. i, v. 382. *Prisci Hist.* § 8, p. 152. *Agath.* lib. i, c. iii, p. 19.



personal observation. The testimony of Agathias is almost equally direct. He apprises us that when Chlodomer fell in the Burgundian war, A. D. 524, his dead body was recognized by the enemy in consequence of his long hair reaching to the shoulders, which was peculiar to the kings of the Franks, and not permitted to their subjects. It is true, however, that some passages seem, at one time metaphorical, at another prosaic, but always loose and indistinct in their expression, which might indicate a general habit among the Franks of wearing long hair, but not so as to derogate from either the prerogative or the peculiarity of the royal family.\*

When Mr. Hallam reaches the complicated and long agitated subjects of the Royal Court, the Feudal Law, and the Judicial Institutions of the Middle Ages, he flounders about hopelessly in the great sea of difficulties by which he is surrounded; but in this particular branch of his mistakes he has usually a goodly fellowship of blunderers to keep him company. His offence, therefore, in this case, is not that he has committed any very gross original errors of his own, but that he has followed with little judgment the erroneous views entertained by others before him, and has neglected to prosecute his own researches until he was rewarded by a discovery of new truths. His errors in connection with these topics are so numerous and so entangled with each other—they are so dependent upon his general misapprehension of the whole mediæval system, and they are also so intertwined with the aberrations of former authors, that it would require a goodly pamphlet to point them out, and a portly volume to explain and rectify them. We are therefore compelled to exclude almost entirely, from the present essay, all notice of this large family of mistakes, although our materials have been diligently collected for their exhibition, and are at this moment before us. This omission is the less serious, as their consequences are partly obviated by Sir Francis Palgrave's able work on the Anglo Saxon Commonwealth, and by the first

\* Amm. Marcel. lib. xvi, c. xii, § 36. "*Comæ fluentes horrebant*"—spoken of the Germans on the Rhine.

part of Mr. Spence's very learned and elaborate treatise on the equitable jurisdiction of the Court of Chancery. There are many points in the latter work from which we dissent, and its views are not wholly satisfactory to us, or consistent with the historical testimonies collected by us, but it is a wonderful improvement on Hallam, is original in its doctrines, and their exposition, and takes a profound and usually true view of mediæval civilization. We leave, therefore, for the present, Mr. Hallam's errors on these important topics to be neutralized by the learning and diligent research of Mr. Spence.

We may mention, however, that Mr. Hallam has found it necessary to recall his strong and rash expressions, which he had employed in his text to deny the dependence of the Feudal System on a Roman origin.\* But even while admitting his former indiscretion, he is anxious to conceal its extent by quibbling about matters in regard to which there is no dispute. None of those who most strenuously ascribed feudalism to a Roman original, ever, pretended to say that it existed as a complete, formal, and exclusive system of organization under the Roman empire. They were as remote from any such imagination as Mr. Hallam would be from asserting that it assumed this perfection of development under Clovis. No one supposes that any thing more can be, or need be proved, than that the genius, which, in the process of centuries and under the influences of circumstances, were ultimately developed into the feudal system, did exist under the Roman empire, and were derived from that source by the barbarians. The thesis adverse to Hallam is simply that the seed of feudalism was Roman, but its cultivation Teutonic. Mr. Hallam's criticism on the remarks of Gothofredus, relative to the lands of the Læti, and his objection that this tribe does not appear from those remarks to have been under the full obligation of the *trinoda necessitas*, are wholly unavailing, because the case of the Læti does not afford the strongest or most direct evidence of

\* Middle Ages, c. ii, pt. i, vol. i, p. 133, c. ii. pt. ii, p. 134. Supplement, note 72, p. 123.

the application of feudal principles by the Romans. It is not our purpose to produce this fuller and more conclusive testimony at present, because we should thus be led into that extensive investigation of the origin of feuds which our limits have compelled us already formally to decline. The evidence exists, and is in our hands, and a small portion of it may be discovered in Spence. Mr. Hallam, however, does not suspect its existence; he apparently knows little of either the Læti or Roman feudalism, but what was to be found in Gothofredus, and though the learned essay of Bocking, upon that class of barbarian allies who were termed Læti,\* might be excusably unknown to our author, we may profitably refer his readers to its erudite pages. But the learning which Bocking has collected might have been known in a great measure to Mr. Hallam, from the original authorities, if he had diligently consulted them, instead of confining his researches habitually to compilations, antiquarian essays, and such compositions, which, valuable as they are in themselves, if discreetly employed, nevertheless expose him in the exclusive use of such materials, to all the errors which result from second-hand information.

It is not creditable to Mr. Hallam that, in this supplementary note on the ancient analogies to the Feudal System, he has made no reference to Spence's work, in which this subject is treated with much ingenuity and superior learning, though, as we have said, not in a manner altogether satisfactory.

The same disposition to gloss over and palliate the errors confessed, which is exhibited in the note just censured, is manifested also in regard to the more flagrant blunder of superciliously discarding all notice of the teachers and progress of the Roman law towards the close of the Middle Ages.† The severe and just castigation administered by the late H. S. Legare for his flippancy in regard to this important topic,

\* A part of Bocking's instructive essay, *De Lætis*, was published in 1838. The whole is inserted in his *Annot. ad Not. Dig. Occ. Imp.* p. 1044<sup>a</sup>-1093.<sup>o</sup>

† *Middle Ages*, ch. ix, Pt. ii, Vol. ii, p. 476. *Suppl.* p. 411.

dispenses us from the duty of dwelling upon the original sin, though we deem it proper to condemn the inadequate atonement offered. In such a case the confession of error should have been frank and full to be at all meritorious, not hesitating and almost retracting while he confesses. He deals daintily with his own offence—he says of it: “This passage is written in a very English spirit”—and winds up with this remark, “I have heard that it (the civil law) is less regarded in France than formerly.” How is it regarded in Germany? How even in England and America? In one sense, it is of course less regarded in France than formerly, since the Code Napoleon has authoritatively incorporated its precepts for practical application in the jurisprudence of the land. The old body may be less needed since the soul has transmigrated into a new and living form. Yet there is no need of such an explanation; the recent literature of France does not sustain Mr. Hallam’s hear-say statement.

It is true that the original and shallow observation which he partially withdraws, was written in a very English spirit, because unfortunately, so far as the knowledge of the civil law is concerned, English and ignorant have been for several centuries convertible terms. But it would have been more becoming in Mr. Hallam if he had candidly employed the latter and less dubious term to characterize his crime. Had he known any thing of those great teachers of legal learning, who rivaled the talents of Papinian and Modestinus, in their restoration of the Roman jurisprudence to its ancient splendor;\*—had he been acquainted with that juridical literature which he affected to despise, he might have read and avoided the censure of a great jurist, who almost anticipated such sciolism as he has displayed. “I know that there are many in these days,” says Francis Baudouin, “not only afflicted with the barbarous ignorance, which fastidiously rejects what it is unable to acquire; but also with the malignant envy which derides the studies of others.” It is but just,

\* The tribute paid to the School of Bologna and its successors by Morhopies Polyhist. I. I. II. §.



however, to Mr. Hallam to mention that the study of the civil law had sunk so low even in Germany, towards the close of the last century, that a contemporary scholar mourned in bitterness its degraded condition.\*

Mr. Hallam has acknowledged, if he has not corrected, and can scarcely be said to have confessed, his arrogant and superficial errors in regard to the civil law. But he leaves unmodified, unrectified, and unexplained, the equally ignorant and presumptuous assertion, that "the canon law was almost entirely founded upon the legislative authority of the pope."† This might be partially true, if applied to the *Decretum Gratiani*, which derived its validity as a text-book from the authority of the popes in some measure; but it is in no respect true of the substance of the canon law. The work of Gratian was merely a compilation, like many others that had preceded it, of the canons established by General Councils, the maxims, and the customs which had grown up and been habitually recognized in the church. The popes had not as much legislative authority in connection with the establishment of the canon law, as Justinian had exercised in regard to the Roman. But it would be a very glaring and ignorant blunder to allege that the civil law was almost entirely founded on the legislative authority of Justinian. Mr. Hallam's blunder is, however, even more gross and mischievous than this, for the great body of the canon law was founded by the Eastern Councils, and compiled by the hands or the authority of the Greek patriarchs, with very little intervention of the popes in the matter. So that Mr. Hallam's observation only displays his total ignorance of the whole subject about which he speaks so confidently. For a history of the tedious and gradual development of the canon law under the Greek empire, and its successive accretions and editions, we must refer to Montreuil's *History of the Byzantine Law*.

\* *Nunc parum abest, quin levitate et desidia hujus Sæculi, circulatoriisque inutiliter, novantium studiis vilesceat nicipiat.*" Saxii *Onomasticon*, vol. ii, p. 28, ad. ann. A. D. 528.

† *Mid. Ages*, Vol. ii, p. 4.

We have been led away from the regular course of Mr. Hallam's blundering, to note errors connected together by slight ties, in later parts of his work. We return to the point from which we made our digression. We cannot hope to take cognizance of all or any very large portion of his mistakes, but as far as is convenient, we desire to consider them in their due order.

Mr. Hallam illustrates in his Supplement the remark which he had made in his text,\* that "the court of Charlemagne was crowded with officers of every rank, some of the most eminent of whom exercised functions about the royal person which would have been thought fit only for slaves in the palace of Augustus or Antoninus." This is true with regard to these emperors; it is probably true of all the earlier emperors of Rome; but the general impression which the remark conveys, and was apparently designed to convey, is undoubtedly erroneous. This was by no means a custom of Teutonic or feudal origin, but was unquestionably borrowed from the Roman empire, where it was much more extensively prevalent, and where it had been in vogue from an early period. Nicephoras Gregoras informs us that the Duke of Russia claimed from the days of Constantine the Great, the hereditary office of high steward in the court of Constantinople.† The antiquity assigned to the Duke of Russia is suspicious, unless we regard him not as the chief of the Muscovites, but as a prince of the Roxolani or Massagetæ. The perusal, however, of the curious compilation of that pedantic man-milliner, Constantine Porphyrogenitus, on the ceremonies of the Byzantine court, will assure us of both the antiquity and the familiarity of the practice under the Greek empire, which is here particularly ascribed to Charlemagne. Codinus Curopalata, though a late writer, proves by the tenor of his remarks, and by his obligations to sources much more ancient than himself, that the whole organization of the imperial

\* Mid. Ages, ch. i, pt. i, vol. i, p. 131. Suppl. Note 71, pp. 122-3.

† Niceph. Greg. lib. vii, c. v, vol. i, p. 239. It is noted in a special digression on the subject misrepresented by Mr. Hallam.

court of Constantinople was founded upon the performance of menial offices about the person of the emperor by distinguished nobles. The same thing may be safely assumed, if necessary, in regard to the court of Ravenna. Mr. Hallam's reluctance to admit a Roman original for mediæval civilization, and his ignorance of the condition of the Roman empire during its decline, and of the relations of the Northern hordes and the Teutonic kingdoms to it, have completely blinded him on this as on many other more important points.

Thus he tells us that the first patents of nobility in France were granted in 1271 by Philip the Hardy, and rejects the testimony of Bouteiller and the assertion of Lauriere, to the effect that the king's authority had been requisite in the preceding age to the creation of nobility, on the ground that lawyers are disposed to ascribe every thing to the prerogative of the crown.\* This is a slander on the legal profession, to which we believe Mr. Hallam belonged. But the custom of granting titles of nobility by letters patent had been prevalent under the Roman empire, was incorporated in the Roman law,† and frequently exercised in favor of the barbarian kings themselves. We have a surviving example of such a patent preserved in Cassiodorus.‡ The presumption, accordingly, is against Mr. Hallam and in favor of Mr. Lauriere. The former thinks, indeed, that the dispute in regard to the origin of nobility in Europe has arisen almost entirely from verbal differences, and he proceeds, as is his wont, to gloss over the difficulty which he feels without knowing how to solve it, or suspecting the true interpretation.§ The mediæval nobility was a lineal descendant from the Roman empire and the Roman law. All the privileges and prerogatives of the English House of Peers individually and collectively were enjoyed by the nobles of Rome and Constantinople under the

\* Middle Ages, ch. ii, pt. ii, vol. i, p. 139. Note, p. 141.

† Cod. xii, 3, § 5, iii, 24, § 3, 2. Justinian Novell, lxx. Alemanni ad Procop. II. A. p. 352.

‡ Cassiodor. Var. lib. ii, Ep. xxviii.

§ Middle Ages, vol. i, p. 106. Vide Suppl. Note 64, pp. 109-113.

falling empire. These usages were at first imitated so far as they were applicable to a people among whom all or nearly all were in some degree noble. They were afterwards more extensively imitated, when settled order and growing prosperity, and the distinction of classes among the conquering race and the larger adoption of the Roman law rendered them appropriate and intelligible.

It is with like ignorance of the state of things anterior to the Teutonic kingdoms, that Mr. Hallam displays his entire unconsciousness of the fact that the prescriptive right enjoyed by the sovereign of supplying himself, during his progress, with necessaries taken from the inhabitants of the vicinage, was itself of Roman origin.\* It was apparently never intermitted in its exercise from the times of the early emperors of Rome.† Antoninus Pius abstained from traveling, except to his estates in Campania, to avoid imposing such a burthen on his people.‡

But we must draw our censures to a close. We have gone over but a small portion of Mr. Hallam's volumes; we have noticed but a few of his mistakes even in that portion of his labors which we have been considering; we are very far from having exhausted our materials; but our limits compel us to bring our observations to a conclusion. The exposition and refutation of error is a much slower and more tedious process than its commission. A single line may contain blunders which it will require pages and sometimes volumes to rectify. This must be our excuse for the space which we have already occupied with the castigation of but a few separate faults. We will briefly add a few others to our list; but must beg that our labors be regarded solely as exemplifications of the gross defects of this standard work, and as indications of that ample harvest of tares which might be gath-

\* Middle Ages, ch. ii, pt. ii, vol. i, p. 156.

† The most important passage in connection with this topic is in the Panegyric of Pliny, c. xx, where he contrasts the moderation of Trajan with the excesses of Domitian.

‡ Julii Capitolini, Vit. Ant. Pii. c. vii. \* \* "dicens, Gravidam esse provincie libus comitatum Principis, etiam nimis parci." Vide Lampridii. Vit. Commodi, c. ix.



ered from it by pains-taking industry and sufficient learning. Our object has simply been to show the existence, the nature, and the extent of Mr. Hallam's deficiencies, that others might be warned from placing any implicit reliance on his statements, notwithstanding the authority which has been ordinarily conceded to them. We have made and make no pretensions to any profound acquaintance with the periods he has treated, though our limited knowledge is sufficient to convince us that he has treated them unsatisfactorily and superficially.

In our remaining observations we shall endeavor to limit ourselves to the proof of the censure hazarded at the outset, that Mr. Hallam undertook and executed his work without any proper sense of the duties and responsibilities of an historian. This is a grave charge, but it can be substantiated; and, if substantiated, throws such discredit on his performance that it must renounce the undue deference which has been paid to it.

We have already had occasion to notice incidentally Mr. Hallam's disregard of original authorities, and his indisposition to enter into long and arduous researches for the illustration of the times which he attempted to depict. But his negligence and nonchalance in these and other respects may easily be rendered still more obvious.

He dismisses the important question of the condition of mediæval Rome with the careless remark, that "the internal history of Rome appears to be obscure, and I have not had opportunities of examining it minutely."<sup>\*</sup> If he had not these opportunities, why did he venture to compound a manual of mediæval history? Yet it would appear, from the general complexion of his view of the state of Europe during the Middle Ages, as if he had not enjoyed, or at least had not availed himself of the abundant opportunities before him in the treatment of any considerable portion of his attractive subject. The principal charge to be alleged against him is, that he has not sufficiently appreciated the obligations and responsibilities of the task which he assumed; that he has not made himself sufficiently master of his subject

<sup>\*</sup> Mid. Ages, ch. iii, Pt. ii, vol. i, p. 281.

that he has compiled almost entirely from compilations, and has abhorred the fatigue of studying the originals for himself; and that he has deemed it compatible with his undertaking to neglect the imperative duty of informing himself thoroughly on the topics discussed by him, in order that he might be able to convey accurate and reliable instruction to his readers. Instead of doing this, he shuffles off the burthen which is too heavy for his shoulders, and evades difficulties with a flippant speech.

Thus, on another occasion, he excuses the failure to pursue his investigations diligently, by saying, "I hold the annals of barbarians so unworthy of remembrance, that I will not detain the reader by naming a sovereign of that obscure race."\* He is speaking of the Visigothic dominion in Spain. This hasty and presumptuous disregard of all subjects which do not happen exactly to please Mr. Hallam's fancy, this unpardonable repudiation of every topic which requires the study of the voluminous originals of Mediæval history; this total incapacity to apprehend the importance of any period, events, or institutions, which have not engaged the special attention of his predecessors, and been elaborated to his hand; these are the causes which render Mr. Hallam's work so unsatisfactory, and, for any thing but the most desultory reading, so valueless. The history of the barbarians, which is so contemptuously slighted, affords the main key to the subsequent history of Europe, and is the most significant portion of Teutonic history for the exhibition of the progress of laws, institutions, and societies. This same obscure race laid the foundations of much of our modern civilization; they were the most advanced and the most progressive of the Teuton tribes for many ages. This very Visigothic dominion, which is so rashly slighted, furnished the germs and originals of nearly all those institutions, which afterwards became so intimately incorporated with the European organization as to give to it in a great measure its distinctive characteristics. Parliaments, written codes, principles of legislation, political doctrines, the ecclesiastical system—all were more or less derived from the rule of the Visigoths in Spain, and the prudence of that obscure race.

\* *Mid. Ages*, c. iv, vol. i, p. 368.

After reading such expressions as this sarcasm on the Visigoths, and wading through the dull and dry detail of unconnected incidents, whose exposition is never irradiated by any comprehensive intelligence of the march of history or the growth of societies and states, it is disgusting as well as ridiculous, to encounter the pompous inanity of the boast, that "it is consonant to the principle of this work, to pass lightly over the common details of history, in order to fix the reader's attention more fully on subjects of philosophical inquiry!"\* Unfortunately, while passing lightly over the common details of history, he passes altogether over its uncommon problems, and rarely catches a glimpse of any thing cognizable as philosophy.

There is a scandalous prostitution of the legitimate functions of the historian to the mere partisanship of political warfare, in the remark that Zurita tells us "the cortes were usually divided into two parties, whigs and tories: *estava ordinariamente dividida in dos partes, la una que pensava procurar el beneficio del regno, y la otra que el servicio del rey,*" tom. iii, fol. 321.† Zurita, of course, says nothing of either whigs or tories, nor is there any such analogy between the modern English and the ancient Arragonese parties as justifies Hallam's intrusion of their names, even for the sake of illustration. It certainly is merely a piece of factious presumption to pretend that the English whigs contemplate in any especial manner the interests of the nation, or surpass the tories in that respect. The remark is only a little bit of dirty whigism, and smacks much more of the symposia of Holland House, in which Mr. Hallam rejoiced, than of the dignity of history, or the closet of an historian.

The chapter on the history of the Greeks and the Mahometan nations is exceedingly meagre and unsatisfactory.‡ It is only a hasty and insipid abridgment of the rapid epitome which Gibbon has devoted to the same subjects. All the interesting institutions of Saracenic origin or development;

\* Middle Ages, ch. iv, vol. i, pp. 409, 410.

† Middle Ages, ch. iv, vol. i, p. 422, note f.

‡ Ib. pp. 474-498.

which flourished by the banks of the Tigris or by those of the Guadalquivir; all the solemn lessons afforded by the lingering decline of civilization at Constantinople, are neglected, and we are merely regaled with a paltry rehash of the confused and disorderly incidents which flock around the death-bed of an expiring nation. Mr. Hallam has no adequate conception of the importance of either the Saracenic empire, or the later Byzantine, in European history. The influence of the former on the nascent literature, science, arts and civility of Europe, are unknown to him, as the influence of the latter on its political and legal organization is unsuspected. He has diligently gathered the chaff, and winnowed it over again, after its frequent previous treatment; but he has added nothing new to the grain which had been garnered, and has disguised the existence of the vast sources of information which those periods contain, by exhibiting them as if they had been absolutely devoid of the germs of future fructification.

These censures only carry us, though we have traveled with hasty steps and long strides, through the first volume of Mr. Hallam's work. The second is much less objectionable, with the exception of the chapter on the Ecclesiastical Power, which he says has been the most highly praised, though we can discover no reason for this commendation, but its greater comparative length, and the more general ignorance in regard to its subject. In the treatment of the English Constitution Mr. Hallam can lay claim to some originality and research, though his views are shallow and erroneous in regard to every thing connected with the *Aula Regia* and the Court of Chancery. In this part of his inquiries he had the materials for investigation around him, and his tastes induced him to use them. His essay on the State of Society is instructive without being comprehensive, and suggestive without being accurate. The vagueness and generality of its scope dispensed with any novel inquiries, and the subject presented so many topics of interest that it could be rendered attractive under any mode of handling. In these chapters of



the second volume the same defects which disfigure the first occur, but they are less glaringly and offensively revealed. they constitute a smaller leaven, and may readily pass unnoticed. It is in that part of his labors which demanded patient diligence, long-continued and arduous study, a comprehensive apprehension of the phenomena of social life under all its forms, intuitive sagacity, profound and varied learning, and rigid accuracy, that Mr. Hallam has most signally failed. He has in consequence produced only a blotched and incompetent narrative, instead of a luminous history of the Middle Ages. He has never recognized the truth that the incidents of declining and of nascent civilization are more pregnant with valuable instruction than the chronicles of flourishing empires. To be rendered so, however, they require much more minute, faithful, and appreciating examination than Mr. Hallam has accorded to the subjects discussed by him. With what lame and tottering steps he has proceeded, we have endeavored to show; and, though omitting most of the errors discovered by us, we have perhaps said enough to prove our thesis, that his work is a broken reed only calculated to pierce the sides of those who would lean on it.

---

ART. III.—THE POWER OF THE GENERAL GOVERNMENT TO CONSTRUCT ROADS OR RAILROADS, as POST-ROADS, WITHIN THE STATES AND TERRITORIES.—*Story's Commentaries on the Constitution.*—Ed. 1851.

THE acquisition of California, and the rapid increase of population in that State, and on the whole north Pacific coast, within our State and territorial limits, have revived many of those questions which, in former years, were the subjects of earnest difference of opinion in Congress, and among the people at large. Those who live upon the eastern and western slopes of the Alleghanies, are separated from the people of

the Pacific shore, by a vast expanse of wilderness, and by the Rocky Mountains and their kindred ranges. While the population of the eastern and western coasts is increasing with fabulous rapidity, the barrier to internal communication remains almost unbroken, and these great segments of our common people are kept widely apart. This circumstance induced a senator from California, in the last Congress, to introduce and advocate a bill for a railroad to the Pacific, which was, practically, to be constructed by the authority of the national Government. The bill, for various reasons, suffered a defeat, but, as the supposed expediency, and the necessity for such a work, have rather increased than diminished, since that time, we may take it for granted that the same senator, if re-elected, or his successor, or others, will present a similar plan for the consideration of Congress, and thus revive the whole question of controversy.

No subject is deserving of more serious attention. It is true that its discussion involves political questions, which have, in past years, divided the whole counsels of the nation. It may, for this reason, be deemed improper to introduce the debate into the columns of a work, which stands professedly neutral as between the national parties of the country. But although we are unwilling to divert our pages from their general purpose of utility to the service of any cause, which may seem, upon first view, to be identical with a present political struggle, yet, when the principles involved have a permanence, which must continue to divide the country, after parties, in their present form of organization, have ceased to exist, we do not hesitate to take part in its discussion. We remember that a judge of the Supreme Court, in an elaborate and most able treatise upon the Constitution of the United States, has been obliged to consider this, and all kindred questions; and we are justified, therefore, in entering upon its discussion, more especially as we desire to make his able argument, to a large extent, the basis of our remarks.

Independently of the perfect propriety of discussing any topic, which has been made the subject of debate by Justice

Story in his Commentaries, we might also say that our duty forbids us to be silent upon the issue of this controversy. We cannot conceal from ourselves that its proper determination is of material importance to the best interests of those States with which our lives and sympathies are inseparably connected. While we honor and revere the union of the members of this confederacy, it is no less natural, than wise, that we should regard with more affectionate concern whatever affects the prosperity of the commonwealth in which we were born. We esteem most highly that love of country, which, beginning at home, and generating there a deep sympathy with republican institutions, looks, afterwards, to the union of the States as the appointed means for the preservation of the general prosperity and happiness.

We do not know that it is necessary for us to indicate to our Southern readers the importance of preserving a strict construction of the Constitution, if such a doctrine can be argumentatively maintained. Our local interests require that commerce should be as free, as possible, from the influence of any legislation that could restrict the largest interchange of our domestic products with the markets of the world. Our institutions, peculiar in their character, demand also for their safety, that the general Government should not exercise any powers, beyond those which belong strictly to its organization ; for, if the wedge once enters, we cannot tell at what point the interference in the powers of the several States may begin or end. It is wisest, for our own sakes, no less than for the true advantage of the country, that we should stand in our National policy and Legislation upon principle alone, refusing to accede to, or countenance, any measures which may seem clearly advantageous or expedient even to ourselves, if we deem them to be inconsistent with the principles by which we construe the charter of the Constitution. We have much reason to know that all the difficulties that have arisen of late in the legislation of the country, have proceeded less from any uncertainty as to the legality or illegality of the measures urged or attempted, than from the careless, or unconsidered precedents set by Congress and by our chief executive officers in earlier days of the

Republic. We are awakened now, fortunately in time, to the knowledge that our rights are not committed by the opinions even of our own fast friends in other periods of our domestic history. We feel that they have performed their fitting office in the preservation of our rights in such emergencies as seemed to threaten imminent danger, but that it remains for the men of this generation to meet the questions of this day, unembarrassed by the opinions and conduct of those who wholly discharged their duty to the issues which divided the country, while they were living, and bore their fitting part in the contest.

We propose in these pages to discuss with brevity the doctrine of internal improvements as laid down by Justice Story and as understood by ourselves. We shall first address ourselves to the 18th chapter, Book III, of his Commentaries on the Constitution. The words in debate are "Congress shall have the power to establish post-offices, and post-roads." The author states that in the original draft the clause stood thus: "Congress shall have the power to establish post-offices," but that the words "and post-roads" were afterwards added. He says that, "upon the construction of this clause, two opposite opinions have been expressed. One maintains that the power to establish post-offices and post-roads can intend no more than the power to direct where post-offices shall be kept, and on what roads the mail shall be carried." The other maintains that "the power comprehends the right to make or construct any roads which Congress may deem proper for the conveyance of the mail, and to keep them in due repair for such purpose." Now the author calls attention to the fact that the Articles of Confederation invested Congress with the sole and exclusive power of "establishing and regulating post-offices from one State to another, throughout all the United States." The word to which he seeks afterwards to give so large a construction, is therefore found in the Articles of Confederation, as well as in the Constitution.

Now, the Government was equally the carrier of the mails, under the Articles of Confederation, as it now is. It could establish post-offices along any route that it might direct, whether that route was practicable for horses alone, or for carriages. It could



determine upon a site for the path of the messenger, as readily as it could upon the site for the office. We desire to know, therefore, whether it did not, under the confederation, as effectually possess the power to establish, in the technical sense of the term, the *route* between the post-offices, as it did to establish the post-offices themselves? And so long as the route was used as a post route, was it not *established* as such by the action of the Federal Congress. Nor was the right less perfect under the old system than it is under the present. For, as the ninth Article of the Confederation gave not only the right to establish post-offices from one State to another, through the United States, but the right also to exact postage on the papers passing through the same, it certainly prevented the State from interposing to prevent communication between one post-office and the other. For the right to charge postage on letters passing through the various post-offices, carried with it the corresponding power and obligation to see to their safe transmission. It would, therefore, have been idle to say that the government should carry the mails, and establish post-offices for their delivery, if the State in which the offices had been located, could at its pleasure, have closed the intervening avenue, or by virtue of sovereign legislative power, have discriminated against the Government in its operations, as a carrier upon the known highway of travel. The right would have existed, under such a construction, to charge for the performance of a service, which any State might have disabled Congress from attempting, by closing up the avenue between one established post-office and another. In our judgment, the reason for adding the words "and post-roads," when the Constitution was under discussion, was to exclude the conclusion of this remaining power in the State, by recognizing the right of the general Government *to designate the line of travel between the post-offices which it might see fit to establish.*

But the distinguished author argues that the word "establish" possesses a wider meaning. He says that "our laws speak of establishing navy hospitals, where land is to be purchased, work done and buildings erected." Let us accept his illustration, and see whether the power to *establish post-offices* existed in this sense

under the Articles of Confederation. Could the old Congress have purchased land in any State and held it, as a proprietor, for any purpose, without the assent of the State? The answer must be that it could not, and yet, it had the right to "establish" post-offices, while it must be conceded that it could not have purchased and held the land necessary for post-office buildings, nor could it have constructed the buildings, by virtue of the power which it acquired under this term. If the signification of the word has changed in its transfer to the present Constitution, it can only be because of its collocation with the words "and post-roads," or because of some general clause in the present constitution, giving to the word a wider signification. It is certain that in the Articles of Confederation the word establish did *not* mean "may buy land for, and build."

It is entirely immaterial to us in what sense the learned commentator may have discovered that the word "establish" has been used in various acts of Congress, and in the preamble to the Constitution itself. The point of the inquiry is the sense in which it was used in the very clause of the Constitution, in which it occurs. This we can best determine by discovering the meaning which it bore in the Articles of Confederation, from which it was in part literally taken. If it did not convey in that instrument the sense that the Federal Congress would buy land for post-office buildings in a State, and construct them afterwards, without the consent of a State, as it surely did not, it cannot be contended that it has a larger signification in the present Constitution. It is difficult to suppose that any one will gravely argue that if the word has this limited signification in reference to post-offices, the interpretation widens when it is applied to the words "and post-roads," immediately succeeding. We cannot so construe this instrument, as to make it read that Congress cannot buy land and erect buildings in a State without its consent, but may buy land and build a post-road.

But we think that a sufficient answer to the elaborate criticism of Justice Story is found in the words of Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the Constitution. In this clause Con-

gress is authorized to exercise exclusive *legislation* over all places, purchased *by consent of the State*, in which the same shall be, for the erection of forts, magazines, arsenals, dock-yards, and other needful buildings. The jurisdiction of Congress is its legislation. It can exercise jurisdiction in no other manner. But its right to purchase for such ends even, as those recited in the clause, is expressly qualified by the recognition that such purchases can only be made with the consent of the State in which the land lies. As all the powers conferred by this 8th section have been properly held to be exclusive, and perfect in themselves, and to exist without the need of further consent of the State, except where the same may be required, the true interpretation of the words "to establish post-offices and post-roads," must be that which is reconcilable with an exclusive power in the Government, to execute the constitutional grant. Wherever the consent of a State is needed to any act, such act lies without the scope of the powers conferred in the 8th article. If, therefore, the consent of a State is required for the purchase of a site for a post-office, or for the building of a post-road, such purchase, or construction, cannot be justified under this 8th section, but must be defended by some other provision of the Constitution. Now, Judge Story declares, conducting his argument to its proper conclusion, that Congress may *build* post-roads, without regard to the consent of the State. Is this reconcilable with the clause which directly recognizes the fact that Congress cannot acquire land for the erection of a fort even, without the consent of the State in which it is located? Can it be possible that the Constitution intended that land might be taken for a post-road without the consent of a State, provided that due compensation was given to its owner, when the only purpose was the facilitating the progress of the mails, but that it could not be required for national defence without the consent of the State in which the site was located? Can it be supposed, for instance, that Congress has not the power, without the consent of the State of Maryland, to purchase a site for a fort on the Patapsco river, but

that it could without its consent construct an air-line railroad as a post-road, through the State of Maryland to connect Norfolk and New York, and thus isolate Baltimore from the direct line of trade and travel? Could it, by making just compensation to the owners of the farms through which such a road passed, construct it without the consent of the State, thus impairing the value of its commercial capital to the extent of millions, when it is conceded that it could not purchase a barren point of land for a national fort, without such consent? It seems to us that the position need only to be stated, to receive its refutation; but yet Congress can do all this, if the word "establish" means what it is said to mean by the distinguished commentator; for the power conferred on Congress, whatever it may be, is exclusive, and can be exercised without the consent of the States.

The learned author in his criticism upon the word "establish," has not rested upon any implication of power, but derives the power from the word itself, as an *express grant*. He says that the received meaning of the words is "to settle firmly, to confirm, to fix, to form or modify, to found, to build firmly, to erect permanently." These definitions we may explain more clearly, by giving all the definitions as contained in Webster, from whom he quotes. Webster says the word means "to settle permanently, as a *covenant*—to erect, fix, or settle, as an *empire*,—to enact, or *decree by authority and for permanency*,—to settle or fix permanently, as a person in business, or as one being in a place,—to make firm, to confirm, or ratify, to settle, or fix what is wavering, doubtful or weak,—to confirm, as *faith*,—to make good,—to set up in the place of another, and to confirm." So Richardson in his Dictionary explains it as meaning "to make steadfast, or able to stand,—to cause to stand firmly,—to set up firmly,—to confirm,—to fix, to settle—strong to stand."

Now if we are to resort to lexicography, we ask if there is one definition, of all these, which bears out the commentator in his ideas that this word confers an express power to *build* post-offices and post-roads? If we give a man authority "to



*establish a house;*" would any one suppose that he was authorized to *build* one? It would be at once construed into a permission to organize a commercial firm. The many instances given, in the text of the Commentaries, show that the word "establish" never bore the meaning in legislative action, with which it is sought to be invested. Take for instance the laws "establishing courts of appeal in cases of capture." Is the *direct* grant or power to *build houses*, in which those courts shall be held, or is it a power to *organize the courts* themselves? Did the preamble of the Constitution, in which among other noted uses, it was said to have been ordained "to establish justice," bear the merely material meaning that it was to authorize the construction of houses, in which justice should be administered? We must deal in like manner with the other illustrations given. They would, we think, all seem to demonstrate that the word "establish" cannot be considered as having the large interpretation of the author.

Nor does it seem to us, that there is more in the argument "*ab inconvenienti*," used in his discussion of the subject. We cannot see how a state could have the right to carry the mails, if this alleged narrow construction was carried out. The right to establish post-offices, certainly confers the exclusive power to receive and transmit all that is properly the subject of postal transmission; and no State could exercise this privilege. Nor do we see the least plausibility in the view that, under a less liberal construction, than that contended for by Justice Story, there might be no power in Congress to punish a robbery of the mails. For, if Congress has the exclusive power to transmit the mails, it has the right to provide for their secure transmission. But, continues he, "passing by considerations of this nature, why does not the power to establish post-offices and post-roads, include the power to make and construct them, when wanted, as well as the power to establish a navy hospital, or a custom-house, a power to make and construct them?" We may reply in the first instance, that this later inquiry rests only upon the

theory that the power is an *implied*, and not an *express* power, since the Constitution no where gives to Congress the *express* power to act in the instances which he here cites. The justification for such legislation must be looked for in the implied powers of Congress, and cannot be found in the grant of express powers, among which he has claimed that this right exists; and although there can be little doubt that such works, as he has mentioned, are proper additaments to the exercise of the direct powers confided to Congress, yet it is certain that the Government cannot become a proprietor, for any of the purposes cited, without the consent of the State in which the land is to be held, or the buildings upon it constructed. These are powers existing indeed by implication, but capable only of exercise by the consent of the State, in which the Government, for its convenience, or security, seeks to be a proprietor. They are, in the strictest sense of the term, incidental to larger powers, which are unquestionably preserved by the Government. But shall it be said that the right to *construct* roads, as post-roads, is an *incident* to the right to *establish* roads as post-roads? It might be as reasonably contended, if the Constitution had contained only a provision authorizing the General Government to build *forts*, that it could, as an implied power, raise an army to garrison them, without any express grant of power to do so. Or, if it had been authorized only to construct docks, that it might build a navy to fill them. The Government, having the right to establish post-offices, is the sole postal agent, and it possesses, therefore, very properly, as an express grant of power, the right to designate and fix upon, or establish the postal routes or roads, which shall be used between places, requiring the exercise of its services as a carrier. But though it may designate, or fix them, it may not make, or construct them.

It may be expedient, while we are upon this branch of the question, to analyze somewhat critically the clauses connected with the supposed grant of power, in order that we may see if they bear any meaning which is inconsistent with the limited interpretation we have given them. In doing this, we are aware

that we venture upon ground, which has been long since occupied by the ablest minds which the country has possessed ; but we may nevertheless allow ourselves the liberty of a succinct review of the leading points of the controversy.

Let us look into Article I, section 8, of the Constitution. The first clause provides that " Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States." The first inquiry is—Whether this power to lay and collect taxes, to provide for the general welfare, enables Congress to apply the proceeds of those taxes to any object it may deem of general welfare? In a word,—May Congress raise money by taxes, and apply it, when raised, to any purpose it may deem conducive to the general welfare? Let us test this query by an instance.

Suppose that Congress should be of opinion that it would better serve the domestic interests of the country—" its general welfare"—that all the leading lines of internal improvement should be in its keeping ; could it, under this clause, appropriate money for their purchase, and hold and manage them as a general proprietor of the stock in each and all? Could it become a national common carrier,—a trading power, conducting commerce between the States? Could it, where individual means were not afforded with sufficient facility for certain classes of useful manufactures, apply the proceeds of its taxes to the purchase of machinery and the management of factories, under government agents, and conducted on account of the public treasury, for " the general welfare?" Can it assume the collection of the States' revenues, and the payment of the civil lists and debts of the States, if it thinks that such a step would conduce to the " general welfare?" Could it, under the Constitution, accept the surrender of the State sovereignties, and convert the confederation into a consolidated government, leaving the State divisions, with their local legislatures, to exist in form only, but not in reality, and lay taxes for the payment of the necessary commutation money? We do not suppose that any will go so far ; and yet a strict deduction from the argument of Judge Story would conduct those,

who are in favor of giving a large interpretation to the powers of Congress, to all these conclusions of power.

But Madison, who was, in the convention, sufficiently inclined to invest the new government with large powers, answers this proposition with the weight of his authority. In the forty-first number of the *Federalist*, he notices the objection, that the power given "to provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States," amounted to "a commission to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defence, or general welfare." But he says that "no stronger proof could be given of the distress under which these writers labor for objections, than their stooping to such a misconstruction. Had no other enumeration, or definition, of the powers of Congress been found in the Constitution, than the general expressions just cited, the authors of the objection might have had some color for it, though it would have been difficult to find a reason for so awkward a form for describing an authority to legislate in all possible cases. But what color can the objection have, when a specification of the objects alluded to by these general terms immediately follows, and is not even separated by a longer pause than a semi-colon? For what purpose could the enumeration of particular powers be inserted, if these and all others were meant to be included in the preceding general power?"

But the argument of Madison upon this point does not stop here. He calls attention to a circumstance which conclusively established the interpretation given by him to these general words. The third and eighth articles of the confederation contain precisely the same idea and expression. The object of the union of the colonies, as described in the third article, was for "their common defence, security of their liberties, and mutual and general welfare." In article eighth, it was agreed "that all charges of war, and all other expenses which shall be incurred for the common defence, or general welfare, and allowed by the United States, in Congress assembled, shall be defrayed out of a common treasury." As Madison justly remarks, these articles, construed by the rules justifying the construction put upon the present Constitution by those who attach so large a meaning to the general words pre-



ceding and concluding the grant of specific powers, would have vested in the old Federal Congress a power to legislate in all cases whatsoever.

So, too, Hamilton, in the thirty-third number of the *Federalist*, in noticing the class of objections made to the clause which gives to Congress the right to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying into execution the powers vested in the government, disclaims the conclusion that it affords any warrant for the exercise of other powers than those granted by the instrument. He says,—“It may be affirmed, with perfect confidence, that the constitutional operation of the intended government would be precisely the same if these clauses were entirely obliterated, as if they were repeated in every article. They are only declaratory of a truth, which would have resulted by necessary and unavoidable implication from the very act of constituting a federal government and vesting it with certain specified powers.” He affirms, in the same essay, without qualification, that “the sweeping clause, as it has *affectedly* been called, has no other force than to authorize the execution of the powers previously expressed.”

In addition to these clear contemporaneous expositions of the meaning of these clauses of the Constitution, it may not be improper to add an argument which seems to us conclusive of the point at issue. The articles of the confederation established the title of the confederacy as “The United States of America.” Each State retained its sovereignty, except so far as it was expressly delegated by the articles to the United States, in Congress assembled. Now, in the articles of confederation, it will be observed that the words “United States” are always used in the precise sense which the word “*confederation*” implies. The third article says, “the said States”—*i. e.* the United States—“hereby severally enter into a firm league,” &c. They are uniformly spoken of, with reference to any exercise of power, as “the United States *in Congress assembled*.” The confederation was the simple *league* between sovereign States. The power of Congress applied to them as sovereignties—as aggregate communities. The league for their common defence and general welfare, was for their welfare and defence as aggregate commu-

nities. With this fact in our minds, let us look to the present Constitution. It has been said that the words of the preamble show that the relation of these communities to each other was altered by the adoption of the Constitution. It is true in some sense; for every modification of the old bond of union had this effect. But our purpose is to ascertain whether their relation to each other was so far altered as to give the power to lay taxes to provide for the general welfare and prosperity a larger significance than is claimed for it by Madison, or than existed under the old confederation.

On the 21st of February, 1787, a resolution was moved and carried in Congress, recommending a convention to meet in Philadelphia to revise the Articles of Confederation, and to report "to Congress and to the several legislatures such alterations and provisions therein as shall, when agreed to in Congress, *and confirmed by the States,* render the federal Constitution adequate to the exigencies of government and the preservation of the Union." Now, the *legislatures* of the several States, holding under the constitutions of their several States, possessed no right to alter the constitutions of such States in any other method than as such constitutions pointed out for their guidance. Yet, it was certain that the new Constitution of the United States altered the constitutions of the several States, because it abridged, or abrogated, powers which were before vested in the legislatures of the several States. It would have been useless, therefore, for the convention, which framed the Constitution, to have referred that instrument to the several State legislatures for their approval, because they had no power to abridge by mere law, or formal assent, the State sovereignties which they represented. The Constitution recognized the ratification, indicated by this congressional resolution, and by the legal necessity of the case, in its seventh and last article; and Congress—by its resolution of the 28th of September, 1786, which provided for the submission of the Constitution in each State "to a convention of delegates, chosen in each State by the people thereof"—further recognized the fact, that the sovereignty of the several States could only be thus abridged by the consent of the representatives of their real sovereignties—the

people of the States. In this way it became the Constitution for the United States of America. The affirmatory action of the convention related back to what had been done by the several delegates. The Constitution did not owe its vitality to the *legislatures* of the several States, but to the *sovereignty* of the several States, *as represented by the people thereof of each, assembled in conventions*. The people did not act otherwise than as members of the several States in which they lived. The Constitution was adopted by *the people of each State*, acting by their agents in State conventions. And this meaning, and none other, is expressed by the preamble, in which it is said that—"We, the people of the United States, in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defence, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity, do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America." It could not have been intended that the Constitution was to be regarded as adopted by the people living within the territorial limits of the United States; for then it would have been referred to a *national* convention, and not to *State* conventions. It could not have been intended to abrogate the sovereignty of the States, or it would not have expressed the purpose to have been "to form a more perfect union of the *States*. It recognized the continued existence of the Union, established by the articles of confederation creating "the United States," but it designed only "*to form a more perfect union.*"

When, therefore, the purpose of this more perfect union is declared, we can understand what is meant by providing for the common defence. This does not mean the defence of individuals; for, if it did, Congress could provide a criminal code and domestic police for the whole Union. It means only for the common defence of the *United States*. Nor do the words, "general welfare," mean the welfare of individuals in the whole Union, or such provision as would promote the welfare of individuals. If it did, it must be intended that the purpose of the Union looked to every form of police and sanitary law in the whole country as properly falling within the purview of the Constitution. It intended only

that this union was to promote the general welfare of the *parties to it, which were the people of the several States, as communities*, thus brought together into a more perfect union. The Constitution, in a word, with the powers it conferred, was ordained to promote the general welfare of those whom its provisions embraced. This is the whole sum of the meaning of this much discussed paragraph; nor does it seem to us that any larger interpretation can be given to it.

That the words, the “United States,” have this *corporate* construction, and not any other sense, would seem to appear from the whole Constitution. It is said that legislative powers are vested in “a Congress of the United States.” Congress has the power to borrow money on the credit of the United States, and so with other provisions. So, therefore, when in the first clause of the 8th section, Congress is authorized to “lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defence and general welfare of the United States, we are better able to understand what was really intended. It certainly could not have been intended that Congress might do any thing, which it imagined to be for the general welfare, if the object could be accomplished by raising the money, necessary to that end, by taxation,—but yet, that it could not act, for the general welfare, by laws operating within the several States, where no taxation was required. Such reasoning would be a simple absurdity. Nor did it mean to give to Congress a general power to raise unlimited means by taxation, and to apply them as it pleased. It required that such levies must be for the payment of the debts,—for the common defence,—and for the general welfare of the *United States*. Not for the benefit of the *several States*, comprising the union, but for the general welfare of the *United States*, in their *corporate and governmental form*. If this had not been designed, it was indeed useless, as Madison has said, to give afterwards to Congress the various special powers, contained in the 8th section. For as Congress had the power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare, there could have been no necessity for giving it



further authority to borrow money on the credit of the United States. Under the latitudinarian Constitution, a national debt, once regarded in England as a national blessing, could have been created for the "general welfare," and the right to lay taxes as a pledge for its payment already existed. Indeed, there is no question but that the interpretation given by Madison, in the passage from the *Federalist*, already quoted, is correct; and that these general words are meant to be limited by the succeeding specific powers, granted to Congress in this important section.

Nor do we think that those, who base the right of the general Government to enter upon a system of internal improvements within the States, fare better, when they rely upon the power of Congress "to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several States, and within the Indian tribes." For whatever may be the multiform meanings of the word "to regulate," it is plain that it must be so construed, with reference to this specific clause, as to have the same meaning in relation to each object to which it is applied, in the clause itself. Whatever interpretation, large or narrow, it may bear in its reference to commerce with foreign nations, it must also have, with reference to commerce among the States. Now let us test the supposed power by an instance. Could Congress select any central point in Canada, and construct a road to a location opposite to Rochester, New York, with a view to promote the commerce between the opposite Lake shores, even with the consent of the Canadian authorities? It certainly could not. Therefore, it must be considered that when the power is given to it to regulate commerce, it is not meant that it is authorized to create under this power, roads and canals, for commerce with foreign nations, but that it should literally regulate,—that is, make rules for the government of the commerce, subsisting, or to subsist, between the United States and foreign nations. The power is not enlarged when it is extended to commerce among the several States, or with the Indian tribes, which are here recognized as subsisting and partially independent communities.

We regard, in fine, the pretence set up in the latitudinarian construction of this clause of the constitution, as the most dangerous attempt at the exercise of consolidated power, which could be devised. In the full meaning of the right alleged to exist, (by Justice Story, and other advocates of this theory,) there is no territorial sanctity, whatever, for the States. Their lines may be crossed, at whatever point the general Government may select. Their commercial interests may be severed or consolidated at its pleasure. They may be isolated, destroyed, or enriched, according to any system of favoritism, which may obtain in the national Legislature. They could be reduced, literally, under the practice of such a system, to the relation of counties in a common state. Nor is the evil of such an interpretation limited to instances of naked territorial aggression. If the right to lay taxes to promote the general welfare, carries with it the large privilege of legislation, that is claimed, the abolitionists of this country can, under the color of this authority, make a more dangerous inroad upon slavery than they have ever yet, with all their audacity, thought of attempting. For, it is clear that if Congress can levy taxes to construct works, because of the advantages, which such would afford, to the "general welfare," thus creating means for its improvement, it may take the same measures to remove whatever it may deem to be an obstruction to the national progress. If improvements, within the States, justify the General Government in laying and collecting taxes for their introduction and permanent establishment, and if it may to this end, under an express clause, take private property on rendering just compensation for it why may not the general Government also seek to promote the "general welfare" by taking to its own account, for purposes of liberation, the slave property of any State, or of all, on making just compensation to the owners? If the power to promote the general welfare means any thing, there are enough, who believe that slavery is productive of physical evils to the whole country, to organize a powerful party, at the moment, on the very basis of such a theory.

But the history of the Constitution, in its formation, shows that this latitudinarian theory has no proper place in the true interpretation of that instrument. It is true that the stricter meanings of this charter have been again and again violated, and that the precedent of one law after another, and the prestige of one great name after another great name, are cited and urged, to justify our imitation and practice. But it does not become us to be startled at this. If the precedents of past legislation, and the opinion of noted men were to be received as authentic and binding expositions of the Constitution, Hamilton would not have labored in vain for a government of more consolidated powers. Precedent would have done the work more effectually, than the theory which he sought in vain to ingraft upon our new born confederation. Fortunately we are protected by a charter, to the terms and history of which we can and will appeal now, and with the same right of exposition, as was possessed by the men of the last generation. Let us therefore, abandon for the present, the discussion of the purely federal opinion of the learned commentator, and examine the history of the Constitution itself, upon this very question of internal improvements, in order that we may see what the framers of that instrument meant, when they gave to Congress the power "to establish post-offices and post-roads."

On the 26th July, 1787, the various propositions which had been adopted in the Federal Convention were referred to a Committee of Detail, with instructions to report the Constitution in a formal shape. No part of the resolutions which were made the subject of this reference, could be considered as applying in any particular to the power in question, except the following :

"Resolved, That the National Legislature ought to possess the legislative rights vested in Congress, and moreover, to legislate in all cases for the general interest of the Union, and also in those, to which the States are separately incompetent, or in which the harmony of the United States may be interrupted by the exercises of individual legislation."

We may remark, with reference to this resolution, that if its explicit phraseology, adopted by the convention, had been afterwards ingrafted upon the report of the committee on revision, there would have been left no room whatever for the arguments made upon this mooted question. But there was referred to the committee, at the same time, a plan for a Constitution, which had been laid before the Convention on the 29th of May previous, by Charles Pinckney. This plan contained the following clauses, among others, "The Legislature of the United States shall have the power to lay, and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises. To regulate commerce among all nations, and among the several States. To establish post and military roads," after further enumeration of powers, it contained this additional grant; "and to make all laws for carrying the foregoing powers into execution."

The committee on Detail, on the 6th of August, made a report, in which the propositions, above referred to, were modified in the following manner:

The first clause of Pinckney's plan, conferring the power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, was adopted *verbatim*. In the second clause, which we have quoted, the loose phraseology "among all nations" was amended, so as to read "with foreign nations." The remainder of the original sentence was preserved entire. The clause "to establish post-offices" was alone reported, and that "to establish post and military roads" was omitted. The general words in Pinkney's plan, at the close of the grant of specific power, were amended so as to read thus; "and to make all laws that shall be necessary and proper, for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers, vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department, or office thereof." The alteration made in this last clause was a stricter limitation upon the powers of Congress, than the more general terms employed by the author of the plan.

Now if the construction given to the words of these and kindred clauses by Judge Story be correct, there would have been no need to confer other powers, than those given by express grant and by the implication of the concluding clause. The Conven-



tion, however, was not of that mind. When the clause was reached, which gave the General Government the right "to establish post-offices," Mr. Gerry moved to add "and post-roads." On this question, Massachusetts, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, South Carolina and Georgia voted—aye; and New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, Pennsylvania and North Carolina voted—no. It was carried, therefore, by a vote of six States to five. No intimation could be clearer, than is afforded by this vote, that the minority regarded this as an enlargement of the powers of Congress, and not as a fuller expression of a conceded right. They were disposed evidently to prevent the Government from doing more than appointing postal agents along such routes, as the *States* might select for usual travel, or transportation. But that it was never intended to regard these words as conferring any right upon the Government to construct roads, appears very conclusively from the subsequent conduct of the convention. On the 14th of September, Dr. Franklin moved to add after the words "and post-roads," above alluded to, a power "to provide for cutting canals, when deemed necessary." Railroads, which are as distinct from ordinary roads, as are canals, then being unfortunately unknown. Mr. Wilson seconded the motion. Mr. Sherman objected, and said "the expense in such cases will fall upon the United States, and the benefit accrue to the places where the canals may be cut." Mr. Wilson replied, that "instead of being an expense to the United States, they may be a source of revenue." Mr. Madison "suggested an enlargement of the motion, into a power to grant charters of incorporations where the interests of the United States might require, and the legislative provisions of individual States may be incompetent." These words were deemed by him proper to be incorporated in the Constitution. Mr. King "thought the power unnecessary." Mr. Wilson replied that "it was necessary to prevent a State from obstructing the general welfare." Mr. King answered that "the States will be prejudiced and divided into parties by it, thus explaining that he meant by the word "unnecessary," which he had used in his objections to the grant of the power, *unnecessary to the purposes of the Union, and not unnecessary in the sense*

*that it was already conferred upon the Government by the Constitution.* For it is certain that, if he had entertained this last opinion, he could not have described it as a power likely to prejudice and divide the States. Mr. Wilson mentioned "the importance of facilitating by canals the communication with *Western settlements.*" Col. Mason was "for limiting the power to the single case of canals." The motion being modified so as to admit of a vote upon the single question of canals, the result was, for the power,—Pennsylvania, Virginia and Georgia; against the power,—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, New Jersey, Delaware, Maryland, North Carolina and South Carolina. There being three States only in the affirmative and eight in the negative, the amendment was lost.

Now we may well assert that, if the contemporaneous debate is entitled to any authority in the exposition of the meaning of the Constitution, there can be no doubt as to the conclusion, at which we ought to arrive in investigating the power of Congress to construct any works of internal improvements. The Madison papers, containing the above debate, were given to the world in 1840. If their contents had been known to Mr. Clay, when he delivered his speech upon the Internal Improvement question, on March 13, 1818, would he have assumed, as he did, that there had been no such question raised in the Convention, which framed the Constitution of the United States; or would he have questioned the authority of any alleged refusal on the part of that Convention to give such power to Congress? Would he have said, as he did, that one of the objections to the concession of the power might have been that it was fairly to be inferred from other specific grants of power? He could not have taken such a position. The brief remarks of Mr. Sherman are the very substance of the whole argument of inexpediency, which, supposing the power to exist, has been the unbroken objection made to its exercise by Congress. The proposition of Mr. Madison was still larger in its scope. For, looking apparently to the difficulty which the United States would experience in conducting such undertakings, if Franklin's plan were adopted, he proposed to confer a power on the Government, to grant charters of incorporation for this end. The

question was practically argued on this motion, and on that of Dr. Franklin; and if debate ever made any proposition clear, it is manifest, from the recorded discussion, that the proposition was lost, not because the Constitution already conferred the power, but because it was considered inexpedient to grant it.

We cannot think it necessary to discuss the argument, sometimes made, that Congress may appropriate money to such works, even if it cannot execute them by its direct authority. It could only do this by virtue of its power to lay and collect taxes to provide for the general welfare, &c.; and the true meaning of this clause has been already sufficiently considered. But, to recur to the debate already noticed, if it was considered inexpedient to grant to Congress the power to incorporate companies, which might have in view purposes of general utility, can it be imagined that it was ever designed to allow Congress to place any portion of the revenue of the General Government at the disposition of companies, over which the General Government could not exercise any corporate control? Can it be supposed that Congress may not levy a tax for the building of a road, under the direction of its own officers, who are responsible to Government authorities, but that it may levy a tax for the building of a road, under a State or municipal direction, where there is no responsibility whatever to the General Government?

Having conducted the argument to this point, let us now make its practical application. We have already observed that the acquisition of California made it desirable that the Pacific and Atlantic coasts should possess some means for internal communication. We are willing to admit that it would be convenient, if a well constructed and well appointed railroad ran from some point on the frontiers of one of our Western States, to the city of San Francisco, or to some other available location on the Pacific shore. We can estimate the availability of such a communication, not only as a means of avoiding the climatic dangers of Isthmus travel, but because it would lie within our own borders, and not be subject to the interruptions of war, or to any of the complications of

diplomatic intercourse with other powers. But notwithstanding all that can be said in behalf of a railroad to the Pacific, as a means of promoting these convenient ends, or as an avenue for opening that hitherto undeveloped commerce with China and the East, which has been the day-dream of statesmen in all lands, we are constrained to oppose the plan for a Pacific railroad in every phase in which they have yet presented themselves to the consideration and support of Congress.

We have endeavored to show, and we trust with some reason, that the Government has no power to construct such a road within the limits of the States, either with, or without the assent of the Legislatures of any of the States, through which it might be designed that it should pass. We now propose to remark briefly upon its supposed duty to build the road within the limits of the *territories*, leaving the States upon either side to complete the connection with the Eastern and Western coasts. In order to understand the proposition contained in this more limited demand of power for the Government of the United States, it will be necessary to consider briefly the relation in which Congress stands to these Territories.

It will be remembered by the reader that a space of three years and a half intervened between the recommendation of the confederation by Congress in 1777 and its adoption by all the States; for Maryland did not assent until March 1st, 1781. The delay of the smaller States was mainly caused by the claim of some of the larger States to vacant lands in the western country, which were, as they asserted, within the limits of their original royal grants, or provincial governments. It is true that the estimate placed by the smaller States upon the value of those lands, was at that time somewhat extravagant, but the subsequent history of the country has proved that their jealousy was wisely exercised against the undue preponderance of the larger members of the confederacy. We cannot at this period determine what the issue of such a difference would have been, if New York had not set the no-



ble example in February, 1780, of ceding a portion of its public lands for the use and benefit of such of the United States, as should become members of the federal alliance. This good work was completed by Virginia in 1784; for in that year the cession of the claims of that State to lands, north-west of the Ohio river, was finally accepted by Congress, and the federal alliance was wholly relieved from the embarrassments of these conflicting claims. But, it must not be supposed that the cessions of the various States vested the general Government with any absolute and unqualified property in the public lands then transferred. This territory, as an examination of the cessions will sufficiently prove, was designed for formation at a future day into "free, convenient and independent governments," to use the language of the State of Maryland. So obviously was this purpose looked to, that the Federal Congress, by its ordinance in 1787, for the government of the North-west Territory was constrained to pass, and did go beyond the powers confided to it by the letter of the Articles of Confederation. And it is well known that the necessity of acquiring an express and enlarged power of dealing with these newly organized territories, and erecting them into States, was a marked inducement to the adoption of the present Constitution.

The territories were never treated as mere tracts of land belonging to the government. No theory relating to them will be found either wise or available, which does not regard Congress as a trustee only for their separate government, until such time as they sufficiently increase in population to claim admission into the Union as States. This is the end for which the territorial governments subsist; and, as a practical wrong is inflicted upon any territory which, convenient in size, and sufficient in population, is not suffered to erect itself into a State and to become a member of the Union, so also a practical wrong is inflicted upon the Union of the States, when Congress applies the revenue derived from the citizens of the States to the furtherance of the interest of a territory soon to become as independent as the States. The power of Congress over the territories is limited, though

the line of its authority is less strictly defined than its authority in the several States. It may grant a right to a railroad through the public domain; for by its proprietary assent alone could such a privilege exist. It may donate sections of land to a work of internal improvement, undertaken by State or corporate authority, because such assistance may further a work which will increase greatly the value of the lands reserved. It can do all this, because it can dispose of the territory of the United States under an express clause in the 4th article of the Constitution. But we ask in vain that authority may be shown for the right of Congress to appropriate money from the public treasury for the construction of a railroad within the limits of the territories. The right given to Congress to dispose of these territories is direct and explicit; but it will not be contended that any such authority, as that claimed, can be eliminated from such a right. Neither can it be urged that the "power to make needful rules or regulations concerning the territory, or other property belonging to the United States," carries with it any such authority. For these words relate, evidently, to a class of laws far different from those which are connected with internal improvements. If the word *laws* had been employed, its wide, generic meaning might have afforded room for debate; but a *railroad* cannot be considered "a rule or a regulation concerning the territory of the United States," in any sense that human ingenuity can devise. Moreover, though the public lands may be donated to such a work, under the limitation which would govern a prudent proprietor, looking to the increased value of the lands reserved through which the proposed improvements are to pass, yet the *proceeds* of the public lands cannot be applied to the construction of such public works, because they are a part of the moneys of the public treasury, and can only be applied to such purposes as are within the scope of those powers of Congress, which are precisely defined by the Constitution.

We do not suppose that it is necessary to show that the proceeds of the public roads cannot be applied to any object for which Congress may not raise money by the imposition of duties; and we have sufficiently argued the limitation placed upon this authority in our preceding pages. The extent of the authority in

Congress to legislate for the territories is a question of great difficulty at this day. We are inclined to think that, if the just and strict constitutional limit upon the authority of Congress to make needful rules and regulations for the territory of the United States had been observed and adhered to at an earlier day in our history, the country would have been spared many of those convulsions which have of late shaken it to the centre.

It may be further remarked that such improvements, made by the general government within a territory, would lead to great difficulties. If they result in the rapid peopling of the territory, and it demands permission to enter into the Union as a State, it is material to inquire the relation in which the government would then stand to such a work. By the creation of the State, the right of eminent domain would be in it, and not in the government. The legislation of the States would apply to the work in the same manner as to the property of any local corporation, or private proprietor; and the government would find itself entangled in the management of a road, when it had lost all political control over the territory through which it was made. Its only resource would be, when the territories were erected into States, to cede the road within the limits of each new State to the authorities thereof, in obedience to the precedent act in the case of the national road. But this course—which was not free from difficulties when the State management extended only to questions of toll and repair—would be productive of endless inconvenience with a railroad, which derives its utility, not so much from the existence of the track, as from the application of the large and extensive machinery upon the road. The government could only relieve itself from the embarrassment of its proprietorship by the creation of a monster corporation, which should stand in its place, and exercise its functions, when the work was completed.

In addition to this view, if the Government assumed to improve as a trustee-proprietor, it would be justly restrained to such improvements, as enhanced the value of the public lands, in some proportion to the sum expended for that object. It could not justify the improvement of the lands it held in trust for all the parties to the Union, upon the theory of the

indirect advantage accruing to them; because it is certain that no rail-road, which it could construct, would equally serve the welfare of all the States, and yet to such an object, its resources only could be applied, if they could be thus used constitutionally. It may be said with great safety, that the Government could locate no line for a Pacific railroad within its territories that would not arouse angry jealousies in one section of the country or another; and we therefore trust that it will leave this work to the States, to the industry of the territorial population, and to the enterprise of capital, which will assuredly seek such investment, when the time is ripe for the enterprise.

Nor would the construction of the railroad by the Government to the borders of the State of California be free from other evils. Congress is, and must be, incompetent to provide for the wise ordering of such an improvement. The history of the National Road is full of warning to any, who desired to enter upon the more gigantic enterprise of the Pacific railroad. The sands of the prairies do not more rapidly absorb the rains of heaven, after a long drought, than would the claims of contractors exhaust the most rapid supplies from the public treasury. We should have legions of government agents literally infesting the extremities of the route, and corrupting and diverting all the channels of industry in the far West. The country and Congress would be given up to land speculators and to claimants upon rescinded contracts for years to come. We should have such a scene as the appropriations, proposed for internal improvements, opened to the country in the Presidency of John Quincy Adams, when Benton, then conservative upon such questions, derided them by saying that no man could find the localities to be improved, without the help of a gazetteer. From such risks the country was then saved by the Maysville road bill veto, and by the promise which it involved. We trust that our political future is not without hope of firmness from the present and future Executives. Before such a road has well entered the wilderness, new States will demand admission from Congress,



through which the proposed route must pass. We should doubtless see them admitted upon conditions for railroad routes, in order that all the parts of some gigantic scheme might be preserved entire. The principle of a voluntary choice by the new States, as to the terms of their internal polity would be wholly broken down, by the necessity of making their earliest legislation conform to the plans of government exigencies, and perhaps of government speculators. They would be constrained, in their own despite, to make their civilization depart from its natural law, and crystallize, as it were, along the line, suspended by the Government over their local territories.

This country has not yet attained a power so centralized, that it can only be content with a road to the Pacific, broad and straight as a Roman highway. Our improvements best prosper, when they go from one point of trade to another, gathering up in their advance the productive prosperity in the country through which they pass. Left to themselves, they will find their way to the Pacific shore, not perhaps with the formal regularity of Dutch canals, but with the sweep, certainty and capacity of great rivers. We can afford to wait a little season for our trade to supply its own means of travel.

## ART. IV. THE HUMAN FAMILY.

*Researches into the Physical History of Mankind.* By JAMES COWLES PRICHARD, M. D., F. R. S., M. R., J. A. Third edition, 5 vols. London, 1847.

*The Natural History of Man.* By JAMES COWLES PRICHARD. Third Edition, 1 vol. London, 1848.

*History, condition and prospects of the Indian Tribes of the United States, or Ethnological researches respecting the Red Men of America.* By HENRY R. SCHOOLCRAFT, LL. D. Published by authority of Congress. 4 vols. quarto, 1854.

*Types of Mankind.* By J. C. NOTT, M. D., Mobile, and GEO. R. GLIDDON, formerly U. S. Consul at Cairo. Fifth Edition. Philadelphia, 1854.

OCCASION was taken in a late article of this Review, to glance at the question concerning the unity of the Human race, so boldly mooted before the American public during the past year, by the issue, in several editions, of the last of the above named works. On that occasion, while credit was extended to the authors for the amount of research and ingenuity expended on their book, it was deemed proper to notice with a word of censure, "the flippant tone which it adopts in alluding to the Bible, as offensive to the devout believer, objectionable in every point of view, and not only uncalled for, but calculated to prevent that impartial consideration of the subject, which tends to elicit truth." And after a slight balancing of opposite arguments, the decision was stated, "That the diversity theory is absolutely proved, no one can maintain, so long as names venerable in the roll of science hold out against it."

In the present article we propose to extend this investigation. To examine the subject in several aspects, and to indicate the general considerations, and the special scientific processes, by which such great master models of vast and accurate research as the Humboldts, Prichards, Chevalier Bunsen and Professors Lepsius and Owen have been brought to the conclusion fully agreeing

with the established sentiment of Christendom, that men under all varieties, are but of one stock, that the human race is, in fact, one family from a common ancestry.

The alternative to this doctrine, urged by Dr. Nott, and Mr. Gliddon, in their "Types of Mankind," is sufficiently distinct. They contend that "*men were created in nations*, and not in a single pair."\* That they have no common original nature, no essentially agreeing rational constitution, and no generally designed merciful arrangement for their diffusive improvement in the present, and their joint participation of a higher future existence. That some are absolutely, and unconditionally "inferior," and not only "born to be ruled," but "destined to live and prosper," merely "till a superior *destroying race shall come to exterminate* and supplant them, and that no philanthropy, no legislation, no missionary labors can change this law."†

That these sentiments are seriously in conflict with the admirable moral tone of the Scriptures, the equitable spirit of modern civilization, and the benign energy of Christian heroism, admits of little doubt. And it must be acknowledged that if scientific processes, fairly conducted do in fact, in this instance and in this manner, utterly break up the moral fabric which the wisdom of ages has sanctioned, and put a final extinguisher upon the best motives and highest hopes of humanity, it is not only "a new thing under the sun," but a most strange and portentous anomaly in the progress of human experience.

For this controlling reason, then, at the outset, we are constrained to distrust the conclusions, now referred to, as unsound, and the methods by which they are reached as not really scientific. And here we are reminded of what, with his accustomed felicity, a distinguished author characterizes as *a species of superstition attached to the notion science*, as if it were an indescribable magical something, different in itself from accurate and classified knowledge, systematically deduced from unquestionable principles, and established facts. A moderate acquaintance with the habitual tendencies of the superficial, though so-called scientific speculation

of the day, will satisfy any one of the justness of this remark of Hugh Miller; a man of high endowments and character, and an accomplished investigator and writer; of whom Prof. Agassiz justly testifies, that "his scientific illustrations are most happily combined with considerations of a higher order, rendering both equally acceptable to the thinking reader."

Science, it should be remembered, is a very humble as well as calm and patient laborer. Whether with Newton gathering pebbles on the shore of the great ocean of truth, or with Bacon seeking admission to the kingdom of nature, as it is said a higher kingdom must be sought by becoming like a child in simplicity of purpose. And when therefore we find large claims proudly put forth in the name of science, tending to revolutionize the practical moral convictions of mankind, and to annihilate the benignant sympathies and actuating motives of humanity, the very incongruity of the procedure brings it at once into suspicion as erroneous and unreliable.

And in addition to this general consideration requiring the most serious questioning of the proposed theory, we have a further special but kindred reason, as Southerners, for meeting it with distrust and subjecting it to unconfiding scrutiny.

The sacred code which guides the conscience of Christendom, and which is beyond question the best directory to duty, in all human relations, is at once our unanswerable reply to all fanatical impugnors of our rights as slave-holders, and our acknowledged standard of the obligations connected with those rights. So long as we abide by the sanctions of this code, we have with us, not only the decisive voice of constitutional law, but, whatever misguided enthusiasts and interested agitators may pretend, the undisturbing acquiescence, if not the full approval of the enlightened Christian mind throughout the world. It is a striking and instructive fact, that the rabid abolitionists have found it necessary in waging war against the South, to direct their batteries against the Sacred Scriptures, either in the way of wild transcendentalism with Parker, of coarse infidelity with Phillips, or of pious sentimentalism conjoined with applauded falsehood, treason and murder with Mrs. Stowe.



And while we are satisfied by the intrinsic and extrinsic evidences attending the sacred code, evidences profoundly revered by such giants of thought, as Bacon, and Newton, and Webster, and thoroughly admitted by the common sense of the leading portion of mankind, that the sanctions of that code rest on an immovable basis of truth, we cannot deem it right or wise or becoming, and we cannot consent, that the defences of our position be transferred from this foundation of rock, to the shifting quicksands of less than doubtful theories. It is not in our view just, and we will not even tacitly allow our enemies the moral advantage of representing, that we hold our slaves only as a higher race of Ourangs, not really contemplated in the authoritative precepts on which the morality of Christendom is founded.

The question then, as presented, is one which does not admit of indifference, on account of its obvious bearing upon our special position as Southerners, as well as upon the moral and higher relations of men every where.

At the same time, however, it is very far from necessary to mingle in its treatment passion and prejudice. And indeed, under varying circumstances it has often been examined by naturalists with entire dispassionateness, as a general matter of scientific interest. And, although, in the progress and results of these inquiries, "we observe," as remarked by Dr. Morton, "that diversity of opinion which is so frequent in human researches,"\* yet has the investigation been, for the most part, conducted as a fair search after truth. Virez supposing that he had ascertained *two* species, Desmoulins, *eleven*, Bory, *thirteen*, and others a still greater number of original kinds among men; while Linnæus, Blumenbach, Cuvier and other distinguished students of nature were settled in the conviction of a strict unity in the human family.

Among investigators in this department of research, the celebrated author of the two works placed first on the list at the head of this article, Dr. James Cowles Prichard, stands unrivaled as a model of freedom and fairness of mind, asso-

\* *Crania Americana*, Introductory Essay, p. 2.

ciated with virtuous reverence for all that is good and approved; cautious examination, conjoined with discriminating sagacity, and the most amazing accumulation of intelligence covering the whole field of inquiry. Setting out with full confidence in the great principle, that "truth can never be found ultimately in opposition to truth,"\* he devoted the energies of a sound mind, sustained erudition, and long life, to exploring the wide range of fact in all branches of knowledge affecting his ultimate inquiry, physical, physiological, psychological, historical, and philological; and after the most copious induction of this kind, under the requirements of an inexorable logic, he was brought to a result thus announced in the closing words of his last work, "we are entitled to draw confidently the conclusion, that all human races are of one species and one family."

"Prichard," says Bunsen, "will not be forgotten in the annals of history." His works contain the best and clearest discussion of all the elements of natural philosophy, which bear upon the great question of the unity of the human race. His ethnological inquiry is conducted on the basis of a clear geographical and ethnological exposition, in which the critical reforms introduced by Ritter, Klaproth, and others, are adopted with independent judgment. In the linguistic portion he availed himself, generally, of the most thorough critical researches, and made use of the best materials which continental and English glossaries and observations offered to him. He had sound knowledge of Greek, Latin, German, &c., and good taste in selecting and naming his authorities. But his great merit is his excellent good sense and sound judgment. . . . As it stands, his work is the best of its kind. . . . Up to the present moment, (April, 1854,) there is no book which treats the question with equal depth and candor.† And further on in his own discussion, the same learned and able

\* Researches, n. p. 7.

† Bunsen's Christianity and mankind, itself a work of prodigious research, in eight solid octavo volumes; earnestly advocating among other things, the unity of the human race. Vol. iii, p. 48.

author pays an additional tribute to the thoroughness of Prichard's expositions. The latter, he affirms, "has *most conclusively shown* how, and under what conditions, varieties become hereditary; and on the other hand, that the greater part of what is called typical in a race, as the form of a skull, and the color of the skin, present exceptions in one and the same tribe.\*

The results thus incidentally brought to notice in this last extract, we shall have occasion to re-examine in another connection; at present, it is the general character of Prichard's mind, methods, and conclusions, which we wish to be distinctly marked;—his "excellent good sense, and sound independent judgment,"—his care to collect the most abundant "observations," and avail himself of "the most thorough critical researches,"—his substantial "knowledge,"—the "depth" of his convictions,—the "clearness" of his thoughts,—and, above all, the "candor" of his spirit.

It is in association with precisely this style of character, this order of mind, and this reliable application of the inductive philosophy, that genuine scientific results are to be looked for in the future, as they have been displayed in the past.

And it is with unfeigned regret that we find ourselves constrained to remark upon the characteristics, so opposite to these in many respects, of a volume which, as the production in part of Southern talent, we had very much rather find worthy only of commendation. There are, as already intimated, in "Types of Mankind," not only blemishes of the most serious nature, but improprieties of tone and purpose, so marked and so extensive, as unavoidably to weaken, if not actually to neutralize its claims to scientific authority.

Prejudice and passion are stamped too conspicuously on its pages to be overlooked by even a casual observer; and it must always be in vain for the noble triumphs of science to be claimed by authors who exhibit such tokens of disturbed

or clouded reason. In proof that we censure not thus unadvisedly, and that the cause of truth requires these traits to be understood, we adduce a few specimens from different portions of the work.

In the memoir of Dr. Morton, with which the book opens, is this significant utterance:—"We have had too much of sentimentalism about the Red Man. It is time that cant was stopped now. Not all the cinnamon-colored vermin west of the Mississippi are worth one drop of that noble heart's blood."\* There is here stereotyped passion, in the terms "cant" and "vermin."

In like manner, and in reference to a higher subject, a spirit of no little bitterness is, in a succeeding portion of the volume, thus expressed:—

"On former occasions, we had attempted to conciliate sectarians, and to reconcile the plain teachings of science with theological prejudices. In return, our opinions and motives have been misrepresented and vilified by self-constituted teachers of the Christian religion. We have, in consequence, now done with all this; and no longer have any apologies to offer, nor favors of lenient criticism to ask. The broad banner of science is herein nailed to the mast. Even in our own brief day, we have beheld one flimsy religious dogma after another consigned to oblivion, while science, on the other hand, has been gaining strength and majesty with time."†

In this expression of feeling and purpose, epithets are accumulated with an angry energy that almost pants in its eagerness. "*Sectarians*," "*theological prejudices*," "*vilified*," "*apologies*," "*favors*," "*flimsy religious dogmas*," bespeak an excitement of mind manifestly inconsistent with the self-possession of reason, the composure of philosophy, and the dignity of science. A calm, clear intellect, assuredly is indispensable to trustworthy scientific investigation. And though we may not absolutely hold that your true philosopher is—

\* Page 38. Note alluding to Mr. Richard H. Kern, killed by the Pah-Utah Indians.

† Page 61.



“ A man whose blood  
Is very snow-broth ; one who never feels  
The wanton stings and motions of the sense,  
But doth rebate, and blunt his natural edge  
With profits of the mind, study and fast ; ”

yet must he be in general, and doubly in reference to great questions he professes to elucidate,

“ Free from gross passion.”

But it is more particularly in the latter and Biblical portion of the book, that prejudice and wrong feeling are most abundantly displayed, and the decorum of legitimate discussion is most objectionably violated.

If Mr. Gliddon thought proper to claim the privilege of mixing up, with the special inquiries of his more scientific associate, all kinds of questions concerning the translators of the English Bible—the authenticity and inspiration of the original—the cosmogony and chronology of Genesis, &c. &c., (in regard to every one of which it were easy to prove, were such discussion here proper, that he is surprisingly misinformed and unfair,)—yet surely it was due to his own standing as a man of letters, and very much more to the learning of ages—the profoundest convictions of the ablest and best men of the present as of past generations—the prevalent sentiment of Christendom, and the good sense and feeling of the enlightened Anglo-Saxon public he was addressing,—that he should at least treat with a decent respect their most sacred beliefs, or, if he pleases, most cherished prejudices. Nothing, certainly, but the blinding influence of prejudice on his own mind, could have induced him to suppose that arrogant mockery, profane jesting, and boastful denunciation, constitute legitimate adjuncts of argument on such subjects.

But he has not left this to inference, inevitable as such inference is from his entire method and tone ; he has actually stamped upon his own pages, with his own hand, the brand of a revengeful and belligerent temper, as his actuating motive. On his last page this is recorded.

“It has so happened, that my surname has been frequently made the target for indiscreet allusions on the part of certain

*theologastii*, without any provocation having been given on my side, through a single personality, in the course of ten years' lectureship upon Oriental Archæology in the United States. To treat such in any other manner than with silent indifference, would have been unbecoming, as well as at the moment of each offence unavailing. I preferred abiding my own convenience: and in the foregoing Part III, I have indicated an easy method of 'carrying the war into Africa.'"

"War," then, is the purpose, war retaliatory, offensive, revengeful. This, whatever may be said of it, in other aspects, is unquestionably a most unreliable state of mind for one who professes to deal scientifically, and endeavors to deal destructively, with the most important practical verities embraced in the range of human intelligence.

But this is not all. As the taste of blood is said to whet the appetite for slaughter, so the excitement of battle seems to have stimulated Mr. Gliddon's desire for carnage. He gives out with the zest of a glowing champion, that he is more than ready for exterminating combat with Revelation and its abettors. "Resolved to pursue this matter," he says, "*usque ad necem*," even to the death, he has reserved for a final struggle the materials of destruction; "because the nature of this work may elicit some hostile comments: and he is a prudent soldier who 'keeps his powder dry.'"\* There may be boldness in all this; there is, however, certainly very little wisdom. Such dire address to the Bible and its friends,

I yield not, I, to man or fate,  
Thou add'st but fuel to my hate,

is a very poor token of the sound heart, clear head, and truth-loving spirit requisite for safely investigating the momentous questions connected with Divine Revelation, and human destiny.

Nor are these the only reasons for distrusting the processes and conclusions of "Types of Mankind," more especially of its latter portion. Discipleship is there avowed, of the phenomenal atheistic philosophy of Comte, known as *positivism*.

And this at once throws the theory of "creation in nations," into the category of Lemarck's development hypothesis, and the speculations of the "Vestiges of Creation;" since it is clear that, if no Creator is acknowledged, there can be no "creation" meant in any true sense. And the notion, after all, involved in the scheme, really is, that in some inexplicable, inconceivable way, men merely appeared in nations, without having been created at all. They only *happened*—without any causation—or waked up from sleeping stocks, unaccountably animated—or grew out of ourangs, which had grown out of frogs, which had been developed from eternal monads under the blind decrees of a Dead Fate.

The issue of the theory that every region had originally its national autochthons, in some such absurdity as this, might indeed have been inferred from the consideration, that such theory is directly in conflict with the relations of means and ends involved in a creative and providential economy. It being well nigh incredible, that a presiding intelligence would, in the act of endowing an order of creatures with the energies and impulses adapted to endless self-multiplication, produce them in countless numbers.

But though the Lamarckian hypothesis might thus have been inferred as involved in the theory of "Types of Mankind," it is the avowal of atheism in the guise of Comte's phenomenal scheme, which converts that inference into something of an acknowledged conclusion.

A conclusion, however, so universally rejected by the common sense of mankind, as well as so thoroughly refuted by the demonstrations of logic and the testimony of science, is not of course willingly confessed. And it is perhaps, but justice to both Dr. Nott and Mr. Gliddon, to admit that they have not fully considered the relation between their theory and the atheistic philosophy to which they have committed themselves. This is the less unlikely, from the indications afforded by Mr. Gliddon, that his acquaintance with Comte's system is derived mainly from the meagre and partial synopsis contained in G. H. Lewes' "Biographical History of Philo-

sophy." That is the only exposition of positivism which he quotes. And, if fully aware of the position he was assuming, he could hardly have ranged himself so complacently among those, whom a thoroughly informed reviewer characterizes so justly "as a cohort of narrow-minded enthusiasts and half-believing admirers, who, on the authority of Mill and Lewes, are taking the atheistic positivism as their creed, while it is unnoticed or despised by the profoundest minds of the age."\*

Nor could he have claimed with such supreme satisfaction to have passed under Comte's leadership "beyond that undeveloped stage of the reasoning faculties, classified "by his master" as theological," and to have taken his place "among the educated who are creating *new religions* for themselves,"† had he not been ignorant of the pregnant fact, that the latest development of that master's system, and of the vaunted process of education towards "creating new religions," is an actual return to the lowest form of "theological" folly. That Comte himself the denier of a God, under the desolation of bereavement, when Madame Clotilde de Vaux, the object of his love, was torn from him by death, sought relief for an aching heart in the most absurd Fetichism, of his own construction, human beings and the higher beasts in the aggregate of their vitality constituting his God, and Madame Clotilde, under some fanciful notion, a supreme goddess!

Whether, however, aware or unaware of all this, Mr. Gliddon, is, by the simple fact of giving it his unconditional endorsement, more than abundantly discredited as a trustworthy explorer of truth. If in possession of the whole case himself, he has deceived, if not so possessing it, he has trifled with his readers. The latter supposition seems most warranted. But even on its basis we cannot exclude some implication of a very culpable unfairness. Because when an author ventures to deal destructively with the practical ground-

\* North British Review, May, 1854.

† Types of Mankind, pp. 576-593.



work of human convictions, and professes to substitute, what he is bold enough to proclaim a better system, he is egregiously misleading, and may be fatally deluding all who accept his proffered guidance.

In all these improprieties of tone, manifestations of temper, and proofs of prejudice, which in spite of our Southern preferences, in regard to at least one of the gentlemen concerned, we are compelled to notice, as pervading the discussions connected with the theory of specific diversity among men, in its latest phase, we find inevitable considerations of conclusive cogency, forbidding a ready acceptance of that theory. And these considerations, superadded to the associations which it involves, as we have seen, with the absurdities of Lamarck's hypothesis, and to its injurious bearing, as we first indicated, upon the moral code of Christendom, and the securest sanctions of our Southern social organization, make out so strong a case of *prima facie*, practical impossibility against that theory, that every right-minded man may at once feel justified in setting it aside, as really untenable and untrue.

This mode of reaching the conclusion, however, though doubtless sound, and perhaps satisfactory to those everywhere-to-be-respected individual minds whose determinations are governed by the seldom erring practical logic of common sense, may not suffice as the ultimate exposition of a responsible reviewer. We shall not therefore need an apology for going much more thoroughly into an analytical examination of the entire question to the full extent indeed, allowed by the limits of our pages. Our method will be, to scrutinize the principal arguments relied upon by the advocates of the diversity theory; and then to adduce in order the chief considerations which establish, in our judgment, conclusively, the specific unity and original identity of the human family.

The first proposition urged in support of the diversity doctrine, as presented in "Types of mankind" is, *that some very marked and otherwise unaccountable relation exists throughout the habitable globe, between the flora and fauna of different dis-*

tricts, as grouped by nature independently, to a great degree, of climate, and the distribution of human varieties. This proposition rests mainly upon the authority of Prof. Agassiz, a gentleman for whose abilities and attainments we, in common with all who are even partially acquainted with the scientific achievements of the age, entertain very high respect, but whose suggestions on points regarding the natural history of man must be regarded as far from conclusive. Partly because his special range of study has lain in another field; partly because he has exhibited in this department a fanciful and fluctuating genius, now inclining to one, and now to another opinion; and partly, because in the very act of lending his name and influence to the doctrine that men were "created in nations," by furnishing for "Types of Mankind" a paper advocating the above described proposition, he admits his own doubt as to an original diversity at all. "*I still hesitate,*" are his own words, "*to assign to each (variety) an independent origin.*"\* No great weight, therefore, belongs to his proposition in this case, or to the particulars supposed to establish it. The exact words of Agassiz, in stating his proposition, are "*that the boundaries within which the different natural combinations of animals are known to be circumscribed upon the surface of our earth, coincide with the natural range of distinct types of man.*" Now, at the outset, it will be noticed what an immense fallacy vitiates this proposition, under the single phrase "*natural range.*"† It either involves the absolute assumption of an original starting up of earth-born nations, each in its own "*natural*" district, a doctrine about which the learned professor declares that to the end he "*hesitates.*" Or it involves some other idea of a fixed relation between regions and races, irreconcilably in conflict with the plainest facts. If it be meant that Europe had original autochthon races, anterior to the immigration of Celts, Teutons, &c., or their possible wandering predecessors, and that our Indian tribes

\* Types, &c., p. 72, Agassiz's paper on Provinces of the animal world, and their relations to types of man.

† Types, p. 53.

sprang up in their several "natural ranges," without connection with other parentage. Then it is a mere assumption of the very thing Professor Agassiz, Dr. Nott, Dr. Usher, and Mr. Gliddon endeavor with all their might to prove, through the laborious processes of a very massive volume. Even though the mists of doubt are not, after all, dispelled from their leading mind. But if that be not what is meant, then it may be unanswerably urged what original and fixed relation England and its flora and fauna sustain to the present Anglo-Saxon population, or to any other people that have entered the island from abroad? And what is the "natural range" of the spreading population of the United States?

But, not to dwell longer upon this radical unsoundness of the proposition in question, let its supposed supports be examined. They are such affirmations as these:—"Among the animals which compose the fauna of a country, we find types belonging exclusively there, and not occurring elsewhere." "The grand divisions of the animal kingdom are primordial, independent of climate." And upon these affirmations, in connection with the general proposition of coincident human types and zoological groups, it is sweepingly alleged "that the laws which regulate the diversity of animals, and their distribution upon earth, apply equally to man, *within the same limits, and in the same degree.*"\*

In regard to these and similar statements, some obvious reflections occur, giving them a very different relation to the issue. Granting, as it is undoubtedly true, that instances occur of very restricted existence of certain classes, alike in the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and that, apart from human agency, neither plant nor animal of any one kind can be found indiscriminately scattered through every region where it could exist; yet, is it not plain that such a fact bears directly against the assertion, that man is controlled, "*within the same limits, and in the same degree,*" as other living things, by "the laws which regulate diversity?"—and

\* "Types," pp. 53-76.

that it bears also very strikingly in favor of an original creation of men in only one centre? Why, it may be confidently urged, should it be supposed that unlimitedly-migratory man was "created in nations" the world over, when the unwieldy walrus is confined to the Arctic shores, the awkward kangaroo, under whatever varieties that exist, to the arid region of New Holland, and the scarcely locomotive sloth to the limits of Southern America? And how did it happen that not a horse, cow, sheep, goat, hog, dog, or cat, of all the numerous varieties of those creatures elsewhere domesticated by man, was found in 1492, &c., existing on the American islands and continent, in companionship with the men there supposed to have once waked up "in nations" out of dust or metamorphosed lizards—or something of that sort? Why, if the laws which regulate diversity apply in exactly the same limits and degree to men and to the lower creatures, did not the "nations" that happened to rise up somehow in America find, on rubbing their eyes and looking about them, some of those very useful voiceless servants at hand, which they might tame and turn to account? The instinctive sagacity of a sound mind at once determines these questions against the diversity theory. An inference from analogy is immediately suggested, that if other orders of animals were originally given being in only one locality, so, probably, was man. That if the lower tribes, so universally adapted to his use, had not their "natural range" in America, in the sense of being created there, neither had he, but that he found his way thither by routes which admitted not of their transfer: a conclusion, indeed, which, it will be seen in the sequel, is remarkably confirmed by Lieut. Maury's discoveries respecting air and ocean currents, and by linguistic and other facts, copiously furnished in the valuable national work by Mr. Schoolcraft, assigned the third place at the head of our article.

The statement that the grand divisions of the animal kingdom are altogether independent of climate, cannot be sustained in any sense subsidiary to the notion of like "primordial" diversities



among men. It is no doubt true that climate alone did not determine the original positions assigned different classes of plants and animals; and yet it is equally certain that every organized form does sustain a very marked relation to climate. "The migration of quadrupeds from one part of the globe to another," observes Sir Charles Lyell, "is prevented by uncongenial climates, and the branches of the ocean which intersect continents. . . . Where the continents of the Old and New World approximate towards each other on the North, the narrow straits which separate them are frozen over in winter, and the distance is further lessened by intervening islands. Thus a passage from one continent to another becomes practicable to such quadrupeds as are fitted to endure the intense cold of the Arctic circle, accordingly the whole Arctic region has become one of the provinces of the animal kingdom, and contains many species common to both the great continents. But the temperate regions of America, which are separated by a wide extent of ocean from those of Europe and Asia, contain each a distinct nation of indigenous quadrupeds." Yet man is there, only under "such variation of form, color and organization," remarks the same widely-informed, unprejudiced and coolly judging author, "as has been convincingly proved to be perfectly consistent with the generally received opinion of an origin from a single pair." And, he continues, having at the same time, be it noted, no theory involving excited feeling to maintain, but simply following up the deductions of a wide-sweeping research. *Were the whole of mankind now cut off with the exception of one family, inhabiting the old or the new continent, or Australia, or even some coral islet of the Pacific, we might expect their descendants, though they should never become more enlightened than the South Sea Islanders, or the Esquimaux, to spread in the course of ages over the whole earth, diffused partly by the tendency of population to increase, in a limited district, beyond the means of subsistence, and partly by the accidental drifting of canoes by tides and currents to distant shores.*"\*

With this unmistakable announcement, of one admitted to have

\* Elements of Geology, vol. iii, pp. 16, 49, 94.

no superior in this department of science, might safely be left the refutation already given of the notion, that well defined distinctions between human races coincide with corresponding limits of definitely circumscribed zoological realms, independently of climate, and only explicable on the theory of corresponding original diversities.

But there are other facts of so striking a character, in irreconcilable conflict with that notion, that it is scarcely allowable to pass on, without listening a moment to their decisive utterance. One of these facts is the established unity of the whole American race, notwithstanding immense diversities of form, color, and appearance, from the misshapen and miserable occupants of Terra del Fuego, to the lordly Iroquois, whom our fathers found so formidable, and the half-torpid Esquimaux still gorging themselves with blubber on the Arctic coasts. To this fact the venerable Mr. Gallatin, so long and so remarkable an investigator of the Indian dialects, bears the following testimony, in perhaps the last public document penned by his hand. "*The several languages of the Aborigines of America, as far as they have been examined, seem to leave no doubt of the unity of that race.*"\* To the same fact, Dr. Morton also, in the last paper ever prepared by himself for publication, and the completion of which was even prevented by his death, thus bears witness: a certain "sameness of organization among such multitudinous tribes, seems to prove, in the geographical sense, the origin of one to have been equally the origin of all."† And even Prof. Agassiz does not deny this fact, indeed he assumes the American race in its totality, as one of the *eight* originally "created nations," which he arbitrarily adopts for his purpose; though the authors of *Types of Mankind* contend for an indefinite number of such "nations." Now with this great fact of human oneness throughout so vast a region, there is plainly no reconciling the Professor's asserted sameness of localities for groups of animals, species and types of men.

\* Letter by the late Hon. Albert Gallatin to the Commissioner of Indian Affairs. Washington, July 21st, 1840. Published in Mr. Schoolcraft's work, vol. iii, p. 397.

† Dr. Morton's paper on the Physical Type of the American Indians, prepared for Mr. Schoolcraft's work, and published in vol. ii, p. 316.

Such reconciliation is attempted indeed by sweeping into one group the endlessly diversified, and in some instances irreconcilably dissociated classes of animals between Labrador and Cape Horn.

But such classification is too manifestly a forcing of facts to suit a theory to be other than worthless. When the formidable grisly bear of the Rocky Mountains, and the bison multitudes of the North Western prairies, with their associated fur and feather-clad companions, are discovered dwelling beneath the same skies, as the ferocious jaguar of Brazil, the strange ant-eater and sloth, and the gorgeous feathered tribes of inter-tropical America, then, and not till then, can any thing like a unity of animal species be affirmed as coinciding with that of the human variety pervading the continent. Another fact of the same character, and conducting to the same conclusion, is the unity also established of the human families, dwelling in the broad area between the delta of the Ganges, the Pillars of Hercules, and the shores of the Baltic. Comparative philology, of which in another connection we shall adduce the testimony, has placed this fact beyond all question. In the language of Bunsen, "there was a time when the ancestors of the Celts, the Germans, the Slavonians, the Greeks, and Italians, the Persians, and Hindoos were living together beneath the same roof."\* Yet who has ever heard of animal forms in the wilds of Scotland and Scandinavia, analogous to the tigers and their associates amid the jungles of Bengal? Still another circumstance controverting in just the opposite way the notion of coterminous human types and animal groups, is the very extensive co-existence of Papuan, and other varieties of negroes, and natives of totally different characteristics, in the great Malayan range of Polynesian Oceanica. "Black, woolly-haired people, resembling in their features and color the negroes of New Guinea, are widely spread in the Indian Archipelago. They inhabit the interior of many islands, from New Guinea, New Britain, and New Ireland, northward to the Philippines, and eastward to the New Hebrides,"\* while the Malaysians, occupying other portions of the same

\* Christianity and mankind, last results of Sanscrit researches, vol. iii, p. 130.

† Prichard's Natural History of Man, p. 346.

islands and in Tahiti and other districts of the Polynesian Paradise, improved into some of the finest specimens of physical man, reaching round in an immense circuit, are found furnishing residents to the African islands of Madagascar, as proved by Humboldt from their language.\* Any one who will turn to the portrait of a Negrito boy given by commander Wilkes of the U. S. Exploring Expedition, vol. 5, p. 306, as a specimen of that race in the Philippines, will at once recognize a head and face, the counterpart to which may be seen by scores, on any Southern Plantation. Yet the true Polynesian tribes of the same islands especially the Irogotes and Pampagnons, are represented by Wilkes as a fine race.

Now either these two varieties of men must be admitted to be not both autochthons of that sweep of islands, or it must be acknowledged that human varieties are not coterminous with certain localities and zoological realms. It matters little which horn of the dilemma be chosen by the advocates of the diversity theory. Either way the fact bears directly against their hypothesis, that all the more marked varieties of men, belong strictly to regions where, in common with coincident groups of plants and animals, they were originally developed.

All these facts, and they might be almost indefinitely extended, prove beyond question that the learned Agassiz has permitted himself to yield to the temptation offered by a certain facility of escape from temptation which it affords, to arrange an arbitrary classification of human varieties, on the one hand, and on the other a fanciful grouping of animals into realms, so as to force them into an agreement, on his artificial plan, which is actually denied in the distribution of nature. No wonder he *hesitates* about the doctrine of original diversity, aware as he cannot but be of such radical unsoundness in the theory of distribution which he has been persuaded to throw off from a most ingenious and versatile mind. We have deemed it proper, on account of the influence of his name

\* Ib. pp. 341-2.



as a naturalist unsurpassed in his peculiar department, thus to indicate the total inconclusiveness of his speculations concerning the origin, distribution, and varieties of mankind, we shall close the refutation of those speculations with another extract from the well nigh decisive judgment of Sir Charles Lyell.

"It is unnecessary," he says, "to accumulate illustrations in order to prove that the stations of different plants and animals depend on a great complication of circumstances, on an immense variety of relations in the state of the animate and inanimate worlds. Every plant requires a certain climate, soil, and other conditions, and often the aid of many animals to maintain its ground. Many animals feed on certain plants, being often restricted to a small number, and sometimes to one only; other members of the animal kingdom feed on plant-eating species, and thus become dependent upon the conditions, not only of their prey, but of the plants consumed by them. . . . The possibility of the existence of a certain species in a certain place, or of its thriving more or less therein, is determined not merely by temperature, humidity, elevation, and other circumstances of the like kind; but also by the existence or non-existence, scarcity or abundance of a particular assemblage of other plants and animals in the same region." . . . Whereas "the power of existing and multiplying in every latitude, and in every variety of situation and climate, which has enabled the great human family to extend itself over the habitable globe, is partly the result of the physical constitution, and partly of the mental prerogative of man. If he did not possess the most enduring and flexible corporeal frame, his arts would not enable him to be the inhabitant of all climates, and to brave the extremes of heat and cold, and the other destructive influences of local situation. Yet notwithstanding this flexibility of bodily frame, we find no signs of indefinite departure from a common standard. And the intermarriages of individuals of the most remote varieties are not less fruitful than between those of the same tribe."\*

\* *Elements of Geology*, vol. iii, pp. 17, 121.

The distinct judgment expressed in the latter portion of this quotation, concerning the specific oneness of the human family under all the endlessly varying gradations of forms, occasioned within certain limits, by the operation of climate and other influences, on an original flexibility of constitution, furnishes a suitable point of transition from one of the main propositions of "Types of Mankind," so delusively suggested by Agassiz—to its other leading affirmation concerning an original, well defined non-transitional, unchangeable distinction of species in the diverse portions of our world's human population. The several statements embodying this affirmation, may be expressed in the following proposition, derived from Dr. Nott's synopsis.\*

*"There exists a genus Homo, embracing many primordial types or species, which have remained permanent, and untransitional, through all recorded time, and despite the most opposite moral and physical influences."*

The stress of this proposition lies obviously in the asserted *definiteness* and *permanence* of the types spoken of. If there be, as alleged, clearly marked boundaries between unlike races, allowing of no intermediate gradations, which seem by insensible blendings to affiliate them, according to the diversified conditions of climate, habit, &c.; and if adequate proof be furnished, that such distinctions have existed since man appeared upon the earth, then it must be conceded that the proposition is not only plausible, but probably sustained. But if there be any failure of evidence as to either of these subordinate elements, the proposition itself, be it noted, at once loses its claimed position, as a truth scientifically established. For if there be any insensible blending of grades between the extreme varieties, so that no line of division can be truly drawn between one and another, then the asserted nontransitional distinctness of types is immediately shown to be a merely arbitrary assumption, not authorized by the facts of nature. Or supposing such separate, ungradational,

\* Types of Mankind, p. 465.

clearly-defined diversities of race, to be made out, and that they have existed for a very long time. Still, if the whole term of human existence be not clearly embraced in the evidence—if there occur any gap in the testimonies of time—if any ancient period be left to doubtful conjecture—then again is the proposition vitiated. Since no one can in that case allege the impossibility, or even improbability of the introduction of strongly marked varieties into one original family, by some such subsequent divine appointment as that of Genesis, ix, 25, 26, 27, to which the prevalent impression of a very remarkable tripartition of human destiny is commonly, and with reason, attributed.

Now, the question is, can either of these two branches of the main proposition be fairly made out? We are well assured, after a very careful examination, that they cannot,—that there exists indeed an absolute impossibility in the way of such proof, in each of the points involved,—that it is altogether, and in the nature of the case, impracticable, with any certainty to trace cranial relics, or monumental delineations, or historical records, those of revelation being excluded, up to any definite approximation of man's primeval age; and consequently impossible to trace diversities of race up to the beginning,—that it is equally impracticable to point out races of men the most extreme indiversity, which have not, ranging between them indefinite varieties so closely approximating either limit as to constitute an insensibly blending gradational series, without any break in the progression, or any interval admitting of a natural line of demarcation, and that consequently it is doubly impossible scientifically to establish the proposition in defence of which crania are piled on crania, and diagram on diagram, in the multiplied pages of "Types of Mankind."

Let us, however, examine the argument under each head, and see if the general allegation be indeed supported by facts.

We take up the point of absolute, definitely bounded types, without interblending varieties. Is it established? Is it true? Does nature so speak?

Let the types, as they are called, be looked at separately, and then collectively. And here it occurs to ask why the introduction of this unusual and unscientific term in a professedly scientific discussion? Types are marks, figures, models; species, in the scientific sense, are classes intrinsically distinct. And although, like almost all other general terms, this may be and has been questioned as to its exact scope, whether it embraces sameness of parentage, as well as correspondence of governing qualities, yet is its meaning sufficiently settled by usage to authorize its adoption in such investigations. Whereas the introduction of another term, and one apparently indicating a fallacious mode of determining specific diversity—viz: by a few superficial marks, is calculated to embarrass instead of elucidating the question, and seems, indeed, to involve a sort of tacit admission that at last the differences contended for as existing among men, are not exactly of the same kind as those scientifically admitted in determining species among lower creatures. But to let this pass, summon the American type. Agassiz designates this as a unit. Mr. Gallatin, in the indication of language, declares “no doubt is left of its being one race.” Dr. Morton, from a certain correspondence of structure in the scattered tribes, affirms “the origin of one to have been equally the origin of all.” Yet what are the facts as to some of the most striking peculiarities which characterize varieties of men? The very marked differences between the warlike hunting tribes, that disputed inch by inch with our fathers the possession of this great country, and the more compactly settled, and therefore more artificially cultivated but less vigorous people, so cruelly butchered and oppressed by Cortez and Pizarro, who has not had occasion to notice? Now Dr. Morton testifies of the old Peruvians, “that they possessed a *brain* no larger than the Hottentot, and New Hollander, and far below that of the barbarous hordes of their own race; 155 crania gave but 75 cubic inches for the average bulk of the brain; . . . of 22 Mexican crania the mean capacity was 79 cubic inches, 4 above that of the Peruvians; . . . while of



161 crania belonging to the Nomadic tribes of North America, the average was 84 cubic inches, or 5 above that of the Aztecs.”\*

Here then is an item of structure on which the authors of “Types of Mankind,” and all advocates of specific diversity, lay great stress, as strongly marking different types. Yet the highest authorities in this case testify that it is not specific or primordial, but only circumstantial, and incident to habits of life. This is Dr. Morton’s account of the matter.

“We know that the government of the incas was of the kind called paternal, and their subjects, in the moral and intellectual sense, were children, who seem neither to have thought nor acted except at the dictation of a master. Theirs was an absolute obedience that knew no limit. Like the Bengalees, they made good soldiers in their native wars, not from any principle of valor, but from the mere sense of passive obedience to their superiors. But the condition of the savage is wholly different. His life is a sleepless vigilance, a perpetual stratagem; and his brain, always in a state of activity, should be larger than that of the docile Peruvian, even though it ceased to grow after adult age.”†

Again, as to *shape of head*, it is of a certain general standard, only “in greater or less degree,” says the same eminent comparative physiologist. And it has exceptions; “a more elongated form being seen among the Missouri tribes, and among the Iroquois and Cherokees.”

In *stature* there is like deviation, *e. g.* “Some of the tribes of Patagonia embrace a remarkable number of tall men, and perhaps their average stature exceeds that of any other of the affiliated nations,” while “whole tribes which possess a comparatively low stature exist in South America.”

In regard to *color*, there are still wider differences. “The Charruas, on the southern shores of the Rio de la Plata, are *almost black*, as are some of the California tribes; while the Batoendys of Brazil, and the Barroas of Chili, are examples of a comparatively *fair tint*. And we are told that, among

\* Mr. Schoolcraft’s work, vol. ii, p. 329, 30.      † Ib.

the islanders of St. Catharine's, on the coast of California, young persons have a mixture of white and red in their complexions, presenting a singular contrast to the inhabitants of the adjacent main land. . . . And the fairness of the Mandans of the Upper Missouri is proverbial."\* "There are many of these people," says Catlin, "whose complexions appear as light as half-breeds; and among women especially there are many whose skins are *almost white*, with the most pleasing symmetry and perfection of features, with hazel, with gray, and with blue eyes."† With regard to the *hair* of the same tribe, Mr. Catlin also states that it is generally "as fine and as soft as silk;" while the usual characteristic of this appendage to the Indian *ensemble*, is its long, black and coarse texture. And although the microscopic observations of Mr. Browne, of Philadelphia, exhibit the circular section as generally belonging to Indian hair, while the slightly oval marks that of the European, and the flattened ellipse that of the Negro; yet specimens are given by him of the oval section from the Indian head, and of a measurement not exceeding that exhibited in the best Caucasian blood, *e.g.* the two diameters of the oval section of one hair from the head of a Choctaw Indian, are given by Mr. Browne as respectively  $\frac{1}{32}$  and  $\frac{1}{36}$  of an inch; and the corresponding measurement of a hair from the noble head of Washington,  $\frac{1}{32}$  and  $\frac{1}{48}$ .‡ Nor can it be doubted, that the soft and silken locks of the Mandans, described by Mr. Catlin, correspond in minute structure with the auburn tresses of our own bright beauties.

Here, then, is a single race of men presenting in itself a very wide range of variation in almost every one of the great features regarded as marking one type from another,—indefinitely approximating, on the one hand, the structure and appearance of well-developed Europeans, and, on the other, those of the more degraded, unintellectual, and swarthy

\* Schoolcraft, vol. ii, p. 329, &c.

† Catlin's Customs, &c., of North American Indians, vol. i, p. 94.

‡ Schoolcraft, vol. iii, p. 388.

portions of the human family. The first support of Dr. Nott's proposition seems fairly to break down under the pressure of this one fact.

But the great Indo-European family exhibits a precisely similar scene of almost endless variation. Who is not familiar with the characteristic features of the sons of Erin, in contrast with those of the countrymen of Kosciusko, and those of the kinsmen of Palafox? London and Paris, Naples and Athens, St. Petersburg and Madrid, present each its own general standard of a great human variety, and yet how widely different are they all from the ancient people of Sanscrit speech in that vast peninsula of Southern Asia, where—

“ The rich soil,  
Wash'd by a thousand rivers, from all sides  
Pours on the nations wealth without control,”

and—

“ The inhabitants are swart, and in their locks  
Betray the tint of the dark hyacinth.”

So, again, with the prodigious multitudes of ever-varying people spread over the immense area from Finland and Hungary, through the wide tract of Northern and Central Asia. These—all that can be included under the general appellations of Finns, Hungarians, Tartars, Turks, Samoieds, Mongolians, and Tungusians—have been shown, by the untiring researches of Rask, Schott, and Castren, into their speech, to constitute one great family of men.

“ After studying,” says Castren, “ for a long number of years, Finnic, Samoiedic, Turkic, Mongolic, and Tungusic dialects, it seems, as far as I can see from my own researches, that there exists between them both a formal and a material congruence, . . . and that they belong to one class or race.”\* Yet, who that looks upon the specimens of these various tribes, as rudely given in our common illustrated modern geographies, but must be struck with the interminable gradations with which they blend into each other between extreme limits, which themselves blend, on the one side, into the

\* Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. iii, p. 278.

highest European, and, on the other, into the lowest form of broad-checked, narrow-headed, low-statured, fish-eating barbarians.

Passing over the great Malayo-Polynesian range already alluded to, of blended varieties between limits approximating the Caucasian in Talistiy and elsewhere, and the dark crisp-haired Hawaiians and others verging negro-ward; and the Semitic stock varying between the traits of the fair daughters of Judah, and those of the black Bedouins of Arabia; we next view the generally tanned and often woolly-haired, but still endlessly varied inhabitants of Africa, undistinguishably blended between the Berber and Egyptian of one extreme, and the Guineans, Hottentots, and Kafirs of the other. The following is the strong testimony of so thoroughly informed a witness as Prof. Lepsius, in a note to the authors of "Types of Mankind" themselves.

"You speak of a *gradation* in the people of the continent of Africa, from the Cape to the North. It is a very curious fact that the languages of the Hottentots and Bushmen. . . . bear some characteristic traits, which are found in the tongues of North-eastern Africa. . . . The whole African continent had, in my view, within a certain time a parent population, and its languages were consequently also analogous.

"I understand what you designate a negroid type in the Egyptian figures, and I have nothing against that observation. But the fact does not interfere with their principal character being Asiatic."\*

So also Mr. Birch of the British Museum. "You are quite right as to the intermediate relation of Egypt to the Asiatic, and Nigritian races."†

And in connection with the above expression of Prof. Lepsius, we quote from him a still more striking fact:

"I have prepared the grammar and vocabulary of the language of the Bischaribas, inhabiting the eastern portion of the Soudan. . . . and both with reference to its grammatical construction, and its position in the development of languages, it *proves itself to be a very remarkable member of the Caucasian stock.*"‡

\* Types &c., p. 233. † Ibid. ‡ Letters from Egypt, &c., Letter xxvi, 28.



“Moreover,” says Bunsen, “the roots of the Egyptian language are, in the majority of cases, monosyllabic, and on the whole identical with the corresponding roots in Sanscrit and Hebrew.”\*

Here then, entering Africa by the valley of the Nile, we find that early civilized and intelligent, though strangely idolatrous people, so much dealt with by the Scriptures and the old classic writers, blending, by language and many physical and intellectual characteristics, with the Japetic and Shemitic stocks. Passing southward, the same stock is traced by the sure guidance of affiliated tongues through Soudan and Abyssinia. The predominant color of the ancient Egyptians is represented, as it is well known, on their monumental tablets, &c., as of a peculiar *red*. And all the Nubians of the Nile, or Berberines, are for the most part “of a red-brown complexion, sometimes approaching black, but still different from the ebony hue of the Negroes proper. Their hair often frizzled and thick, yet not precisely similar to that of the Negroes of Guinea.” Of the Abyssinians, Baron Larrey says that they belong to the same general class with the Berberines and Egyptians, “countenances full, without being puffed; eyes beautiful, clear, almond-shaped, languishing; cheek-bones projecting; noses nearly straight, rounded at the ends; nostrils dilated; mouth of moderate size; lips thick; teeth white, regular and scarcely projecting; beard and hair black and crisp; and complexions the color of copper.”†

Connected with the Abyssinians, are the Gallas, a race extensively spread in eastern inter-tropical Africa, and one of those holding an intermediate place, between the Arabian on the one side, and the Negro on the other.”‡

“Their countenance,” says Dr. Ruppell, “is rounder than that of other Abyssinian nations; noses straight, but short; lips thick, but not yet like those of the negroes; hair thick, strongly frizzled, and almost woolly.”

\* Christianity and Mankind, vol. iii, p. 185.

† Prichard, Natural History of Man, p. 285.

‡ Ibid. p. 287.

From the lower Nile, tracing westward the Mediterranean border of Africa to the Straits, we note various Berber tribes, spread over the region of Ancient Lybia. Here the Tyrian colonists of old found both fixed and desert-roving tribes.

“Hinc Gatulæ urbes, genus insuperabile bello  
Et humidæ infreni cingunt, et inhospita Lyrtis;  
Hinc deserta citi regio, lateque furentes  
Barcæ. . . .”

And here African chiefs,

“Jarbas  
“Ductoresque alii, quos Africa terra triumphis  
Dives alit—,”

deemed themselves fit suitors for fair Dido's hand.

These Berbers are described “as in general of a swarthy color, with dark hair; but those who inhabit the mountains of Auress, or Mons Aurarius, though they speak the same language, are of a fair and ruddy complexion, and their hair is of a deep yellow.”\* The Tuarzk Berbers, consisting of many different tribes spread through all the habitable part of the great plain of Sahara, are especially remarkable, since they are found to “differ from each other most strikingly in physical traits according to the climates where they dwell, being in some parts white, in others black, but without the features of negroes.”†

Southward to the mountain chain ranging nearly parallel to the equator, and at a distance of some 10° therefrom, nearly bisecting the continent, including all that can be occupied of the vast sandy sea, is an immense expanse over which are spread a still greater variety. Some of the people of the interior are described as “very handsome;” the nations of Haïssa, for example, whom Mr. Jackson declares to “possess a peculiarly open and noble countenance, with prominent noses, and expressive eyes.”‡ While others, for instance the Barnawi, are reputed to be more like the ideal negro. And as to the intellectual capacities of these tribes, the description given by the celebrated Mungo Park, of Lego, the capital of Bam-

\* Ibid. p. 265

† Prichard p. 265.

‡ Ib. p. 294.

barra, may serve as an illustration. "The view of this extensive city (numbering some 30,000 inhabitants,) with its flat-roofed two-story houses; its mosques seen in every quarter; the ferries conveying men and horses of the Niger; the numerous canoes upon the river; the crowded population and the cultivated state of the surrounding country; formed altogether a prospect of civilization and magnificence which I little expected to find in the bosom of Africa."\*

Toward the Atlantic extremity of the great equatorial mountain chain are found still other varieties of men. On the northward slope, range the Mandingoes, one of the most powerful, numerous and intelligent of the African races, of whom Golberry declares, "that they resemble the blacks of India more than those of Africa."† Though Park states that they are not so handsome as the Jolops, who are the most beautiful, and at the same time the blackest people in Africa, with hair, however of the kind termed completely woolly. The color of the Mandingoes is a yellowish black. Some of them, according to Major Laing, resemble, in many of their customs, the ancient Romans.

On the western declivity of the Hong chain, occur the Fulahs in power. A people identical with the conquering Felatahs in central Africa. The intelligent French traveler, Mr. Golberry, describes them as "fine men, robust and courageous; possessing a strong mind, cautious and prudent, understanding commerce, and traveling, in the capacity of merchants, even to the extremity of the Gulf of Guinea." "Their women," he says, "are handsome and sprightly. The color of their skin is a kind of reddish black. Their countenances are regular, and their hair is longer, and not so woolly, as that of the common negroes. And their language is more elegant and sonorous than those of the nations by whom they are surrounded." From their appearance, and other circumstances connected with the Felatahs and Fulahs, M. d'Eichthal, in an elaborate memoir, maintains that they are an offset from the Polynesian race.

\* Prichard, p. 294.

† Ib.

On the southern slope of the great range of mountains which terminates in the Sierra, and reaching round through a vast circuit of maritime country to the inner angle of the Bight of Benin, are found the people presenting the negro traits in full development. Upon these it is needless to dwell, familiar as they are to almost every resident of this country.

The interior of Africa, south of the equator, is yet very imperfectly known to civilized men. And it is vain to speculate about the races occupying a region hitherto so comparatively inaccessible. Prof. Ritter after the fullest practicable investigation, represents the great plateau of southern Africa, as rising in every part at no great distance from the coast, supported on each side by a mountainous border, which offers an immense barrier in front of the surrounding ocean. "This elevated basin it is believed, like all other regions so situated, contains vast lakes and immense mountain-plains, a theatre, where mankind must have formed themselves into peculiar races, during immemorial times, as they received the impress which physical agents were fitted to produce. In a country so analogous in its conditions to the high region of eastern Asia, we should expect to find some points of resemblance in the tribes of people, to the inhabitants of the last named region. Accordingly in the nations of south Africa, there are many points, both in their physical and moral character, which bear a comparison with the great nomadic tribes of Mongolia and Daouria."\*

We can only glance at the characteristics of these southern tribes. The Hottentots, like our Indians, have deteriorated and dwindled before the devastations of vitiated civilization. They were a pastoral people, active and courageous, though under a peculiar patriarchal government, mild and contented. Now through severe treatment they have become the most degraded of men.

Their descendants, the miserable Bushmen, as described by

\* Prichard.



the missionary Bonatz, are "of small stature, dirty-yellow color, prominent forehead, much depressed nose, and thick projecting lips. Their constitution so much injured by dissolute habits, and constant smoking of duhra, that both old and young look wrinkled and decrepid." Dr. Knox, who has seen the people in their native country, testifies that the face of the Hottentot resembles that of the Kalmuc, excepting in the greater thickness of the lips; and he sets them down as a branch of the Mongolian race. In some important points their crania resemble those of the northern Asiatics, and Esquimaux.\*

The Kafirs, north and east of the Hottentots, are thus described by Prof. Lichtenstein: "The universal characteristics of all the tribes of this great nation consist in an external form and figure, varying exceedingly from the other nations of Africa. They are taller, stronger, and better proportioned. Their color is brown; their hair black and woolly. They have the high forehead, and prominent nose of the Europeans, the thick lips of the Negroes, and the high cheek bones of the Hottentots." Ascending northwards along the eastern coast, are people analogous to the Kafirs, and speaking cognate tongues. "The farther our travelers advanced from the coast," says Capt. Owen, "the more they observed the natives to improve in appearance, of those of Moroora, some are perfect models of the human form, their hair is not woolly, but grows long, turns in slender curls, and is neatly plaited."†

In his "Researches," Prichard has shown that there are strong grounds for concluding that all the nations known to inhabit Africa south of the equator, with the exception of the Hottentots, speak idioms which, if not dialects of one mother tongue, may be considered as belonging to one family of languages. And the exception thus noticed will be at once associated with the fact, before quoted from Lepsius, that the dialects of the Hottentots and bushmen, are of the same family with those of north eastern Africa.

\* Prichard. † Ibid.

We have thus made a rapid circuit of the vast African continent; glancing at its multitudinous tribes, some of whom deviate more widely from the fine European standard, than perhaps any other human varieties, except perhaps the Negroes of Australia, who are allied to those of New Britain, &c., already referred to, and originally derived, most probably, as we shall see, from Africa; and in the whole range, we discover the same endless variations, and gradational blendings between the widest extremes, exhibited by all the other people of the earth.

In *color*, they vary through every shade, between the appropriate European that sometimes appeared in Egypt, and still exists in the neighborhood of Mount Atlas, and the polished ebony of the thoroughly dyed Negro. In *physiognomy*, they range between the elegant Grecian outline, and the exaggerated monstrosity of prognathous development. In *texture*, &c., of *hair*, they exhibit every grade from the soft Asiatic, and even auburn locks of some Egyptians, and of the Aurarian Berbers, through the long and plaited ringlets of the Morooran Kafirs, the short and crisp curls of the Nubian Berberines, the thick and frizzled half-wool-like covering of the diffused Galla, and the still more woolly-head growth of the sagacious Felahs, to the thorough developed Negro tufts of the Guinean tribes.

In every important particular that marks varieties of men, the inhabitants of Africa vary with such indefinite blendings, of one grade into another, between the Caucasian standard, and the lowest Negro specimen, that it is impossible to draw a line of division at any point of the skull, and affirm here one type ends, and another begins.

This then is the decision of America, of Europe, of Asia, of Oceanica, and of Africa. There are no absolute definitely bounded types of men without indistinguishably inter-blending varieties: no such unconditionally fixed boundaries, circumscribing precisely marked families, separating them from all others, and allowing of no transitional instances, as assumed in the diversity proposition; and consequently the

first postulate of that proposition neither is, nor can be sustained.

We pass then to its other affirmation, *permanence* of type through all time. And here it is of course to be noticed, that with the evidence just adduced full in view, so entirely discrediting the assumption of definitely bounded, and unblending varieties of men, we can only use the term type in this connection as designating an ideal model, supposed to be more or less approximated by individuals through some indefinite range. The point alleged, however, we wish distinctly and fairly to examine. It is not only that there have been Negroes in the world, from the beginning, as well as Hindoos and Europeans, Mongolians, Samoiedans, and North American Indians; but that Greek, Roman, and Celt, Scandinavian, Saxon, German, and Slave, &c., and indeed almost every traceable people on the globe, are now, without change, save perhaps, a little increase, just such as they were when first waking up to conscious being.

"*Nothing short of a miracle,*" is the strong and bold assertion, "*could have evolved all the multifarious Caucasian forms out of one primitive stock.*"\* And an attempt is seriously made to extort from history, some support for the idea that each separate tribe always had been what it subsequently was. So extravagant a statement however, directly in the teeth of the most commonly known historical facts, and totally disproved by undeniable linguistic affiliations, is not worth considerate refutation. It is immediately set aside, we must be permitted to say, by its own absurdity. Nor is this all, the earnest advocacy of a doctrine so absurd, carries with it something more than suspicions for the whole theory. How can gentlemen who blunder so seriously on points open to universal apprehension, be relied upon as "knowing whereof they affirm" in matters of a more recondite character?

But not to take advantage of this extravagance in detail, we accept the question in its more prominent features, and

\* Types of Mankind, p. 89.

candidly meet the inquiry concerning human forms the most widely separated. Has it been made out documentally, monumentally, craniologically, or in any other way, can it be made out that the white race has remained unchanged, and the Negro race unvarying, through all time, and in the language of Dr. Nott, "in spite of all the climates of the globe."\*

And the first consideration on the subject that occurs is, if it be so, it is a very wide departure from the general laws of specific existence. The following, says Lyell, may be admitted as laws prevailing in the economy of animated nature: "first, that the organization of individuals is capable of being modified to a limited extent by the force of external causes; secondly, that these modifications are, to a certain extent, transmissible to their offspring; thirdly, that there are fixed limits, beyond which the descendants from common parents can never deviate from a certain type; fourthly, that each species springs from one original stock, and can never be permanently confounded by intermixing with the progeny of any other stock."† If, then, it can be shown of the white race, or of the black, that no modification of organization has ever been produced by extremes of climate, food, and other commonly operative influences, that can be demonstrated concerning them, which can be exhibited in no other extensively distributed species of animals on our planet!

But the advocates of this theory, discerning the bearing of analogy against their scheme, very positively repudiate it as a legitimate element of scientific investigation. Notwithstanding the implied necessity of relying on analogy at the very basis of every inductive method, "the diversity of races must be accepted by science as a fact," they say, "independently of theology, and of all *analogies* or reasons drawn from the animal kingdom."\* And this is said, be it remarked, at the outset of a ponderous book, professing to disprove the Bible, and to prove that "men were created in nations," and so utterly failing at last in the proof, that its leading scien-

\* Types, &c., p. 111.    † Elements, p. 433.    ‡ Types, p. 56.



tific mind, in spite of fanciful tendencies and strong partialities, pleads guilty to final doubt on the subject.

But, passing by analogy, we address ourselves to the alleged evidence of facts. The Jews are adduced as a specimen of permanence. They certainly do stand marvelously among the nations, unabsorbed, unobliterated, untransformed,—a fossil people in the deposits of time. But the Christian derives from this instance what he deems a vastly better lesson than that suggested. And the physiologist finds influences kept in operation on the Jewish mind and habit, well calculated to react upon the physiognomy and preserve some of its marked features, under the considerable changes of other kinds which the people are known to have undergone in different regions.

Stress is also laid upon the correspondence between the crania gotten from ancient places of sepulture, and the modern heads of people in the same regions, supposed to be descended from those there buried. This, however, is plainly inconclusive to the purpose, since in such cases the former and the recent have existed under conditions too similar to necessitate a wide deviation.

The main evidence, after all, relied upon, is the existence of Negro delineations on the monuments of Egypt. And we frankly acknowledge there is, at first view, something in this circumstance apparently favoring the asserted original existence, even from the very first, of the Negro race; but it is only on a superficial view, and merely in appearance.

Nobody knows how many years or centuries elapsed between the creation of man, or the flood of Noah, and the construction of these monuments. There may have been abundant time for the *Nisus Formativi*, or constitutional vital tendencies severally imparted to the sons of one father, to be developed under circumstances favorable to the introduction and transmission of the forms contemplated in such imparted tendencies, to a very extreme degree. It by no means necessarily requires a very enormous period for peculiar influences to work out, in a species possessing some special tendencies,

the extreme results which they are capable of producing in that species. "It follows," says Sir Charles Lyell, "from many facts, that a short period of time is generally sufficient to effect nearly the whole change which an alteration of external circumstances can bring about in the habits of a species."\*

It may very well have been, therefore, that the descendants of one son of a family, who had received a certain constitutional tendency, according to a great Providential plan, passing into Egypt, occupied the rich valley of the Nile, and, after a moderate period, multiplying greatly, spread themselves to the southward, and experienced, under the operation of causes adapted to develop it, the evolution in varying measure of that general tendency they had inherited; until, ere long, the diversified grades of dark skin, crisped hair, and prominent lips were produced, terminating in the extreme of thorough Negro peculiarities. And that some of these should, in the course of no great number of centuries, considering the course of the Nile valley and the general relations of the country, be introduced into Egypt by curiosity, trade, or war, could hardly be otherwise than inevitable.

Now it is worthy of remark, in this connection, that while Bunsen and Lepsius, certainly the best informed Egypto-chronologists of this or any age, from the monuments, assign to the old Egyptian monarchy an antiquity reaching back to 3893 B. C. Even the industrious authors of "Types of Mankind," after scrutinizing the records from Memphis to Merve, *can find no Negro delineation more ancient than the "twenty-fourth century B.C."*† It is true they claim the right, on finding that Egyptologists allow such delineations as occurring some twenty-three centuries before our era, to "*infer* that these Nigritian types were cotemporary with the earliest Egyptians."‡ But it is manifest that an inference filling so prodigious a gap as *sixteen centuries*, is the mere substitution

\* Elements, vol. ii, p. 464.

† Types, p. 259.

‡ See Bunsen's Egypt's Place in Universal History, § 1, *passim*.

of bold assumption for non-existing evidence. Science no more allows such random leaps to conclusions, than justice would sanction the procedure of a jury hastening to consign a perhaps innocent fellow-creature to the gallows, by bridging with inferential guesses vast chasms in testimony.

The truth is, the utter absence of all Negro representations from the oldest Egyptian monuments through a period as yet ascertained of sixteen hundred years, is a most significant fact, in contravention of the very inference and theory of absolute original cotemporaneousness. The very occurrence of a Negroid form in these sketches, only at the end of a considerable period, during which the delineating art was practiced, is a striking indication that not till then had those forms become familiar in Egypt, a singular confirmation of the view entertained by Lepsius and Bunsen, that the African races were developed only in the course of ages from Egypt downwards.

In arguing thus, from the Maneto-monumental chronology, we neither admit nor deny its absolute correctness. It may be generally true. It may be partially erroneous. But we are authorized to suppose that through its entire range it is proportionally the one, or the other. So as in either view to leave the argument entirely valid.

Nor do we intend in conditionally admitting the most extended Egyptian chronology, or even some reasonable indefinite period between its farthest limit and the Noachian deluge, to approximate in the smallest degree the disrespectful treatment of time-calculations, heretofore founded on the genealogical lists of the Bible, in which the authors of "Types of Mankind" have so sneeringly and unbecomingly indulged, as one mode of making "*war*" on a belief in revelation. While believing, with Lepsius and Bunsen,\* that the Old Testament, as well as the New, was designed for practical religious benefit, and not to convey by inspiration a full account of ancient chronology, or any other branch of mere

\* See Letters from Egypt, &c., p. 361, and Egypt's place in Universal History, pp. 160—185.

human knowledge—and with Michaelis and Prichard, that the genealogical lists between Abraham and Noah may be incomplete, as indicated by a comparison of Genesis x, 24, and Luke iii, 36, and 1 Chronicles vi, 1-4, and vii, 23-27; we also believe with them all, (see their strong expressions in the places referred to,) that there is in the world no other history so truthful and accurate as that of the Bible, where it professes to give, incidentally, a full and unbroken narrative.

Egypt and its monuments furnish then no reliable evidence for the contemporaneousness and permanence, *ab initio*, of the white and black varieties of men, or of primordial specific distinctions between them. But the direct contrary. How else, indeed, should the two most consummate Egyptologists be among the most earnest advocates in the history of science, of a strict unity in the human family?

Another weak support for the primitive and ever continued diversity doctrine, is the supposed Indian skull dug up from among buried stumps, &c., some sixteen feet below the surface at New Orleans, and by a most credulous calculation referred to an imaginary date 57,000 year ago.\* Inferences founded on a calculation so totally in conflict with the known progress of history and human development; with the mature convictions of Lyell, Murcheson, and the soundest judging geologists; with the comparatively recent dates of the oldest recorded astronomical observations; the most ancient of which ever heard of, Laplace tells us in his *Système du Monde*, are some rude Chinese notices of eclipses 2000 years B. C., and the first that can be relied on at all only 1100 years B. C.; and with the limited range of even Egyptian chronology, are too preposterous to require serious refutation.

One other statement adduced in behalf of unchangeable permanence and primordial distinction of race remains to be considered, viz: that the Negroes in America have not improved, and are not improvable, save in some lower particulars scarcely worthy of notice.

\* See Types, &c., p. 338.



The remark of Sir Charles Lyell, that they are undergoing a manifest improvement, is pronounced an "unscientific assertion." "One or two generations of domestic culture," it is affirmed, effect all the improvement of which Negro organism is susceptible.\*

Respecting this, as a question of fact, most readers in the United States, and nearly every resident of our Southern section, have some means of judging from personal observation. Such observations, it is true, embrace too brief a period to furnish any satisfactory solution of the question, still they may give an impression entitled to some credit, as to the tendencies in the case, and especially when the observed characteristics of our blacks are compared with descriptions or delineations to be met with of the traits still prevalent in Guinea. Our own impression, derived from such sources and from life-long familiarity with Southern plantation life, and intimate acquaintance with slaves, some of whom as known by us in infancy were natives of Africa, is, that Lyell was not so much mistaken on this point; and that notwithstanding exaggerated specimens of the lowest standard not unfrequently to be seen, there is on the whole, and apart from all suggested suspicions of mixed blood, a very marked improvement of the race, as such, physically, intellectually, and morally. The accomplishment of such a result, indeed, may be regarded as among the final causes by which their destiny has been determined. A principle which Southerners may on the most solid basis of truth triumphantly maintain against all opposers, in vindication of their moral position, as part of a vast scheme of an all-wise and benign Providence.

But in thus giving our impression on the particular point of a considerable degree of actual elevation, already, and to be still more accomplished for the race in our Southern country, we are by no means committing ourselves to a general theory of possible upward development in this or any other race. Elevation and degradation are very opposite processes,

\* Ibid. p. 260.

in individuals, families, and races. The one, according, as it would seem, to a prevalent constitution of nature, is for the most part comparatively easy to be effected and soon accomplished. The other, even when practicable, as often it is not, is extremely difficult and of slow attainment. And it does not at all follow that because one set of influences rapidly evolves a deteriorating tendency to its lowest limit, influences of an opposite character can fully if at all restore the depreciated individual or class. A constitution seriously impaired by exposure or excess can seldom be by any means completely renovated, and the taints of blood fixed by repeated transmission under circumstances adapted to the tendency, are sometimes ineradicable by any remedial measures. As the converse of a proposition is not necessarily true in logic, so the reverse of a deteriorating process may not be attainable in nature. The divine plan, though having admitted, under given conditions, a downward deviation from a stock coincident with the best Semitic or Japetic, to the lowest Negro, may not, even under opposite conditions admit a complete return to such coincidence. A very extensive range of improbability, indeed, in creatures of almost every class, under favorable influences, must be admitted as a general law of nature. And such instances as the Mandan Indians, the Malayans of Tahiti, and the Aurarian Berbers, actually exhibit that improbability in varieties of men of very marked character, and on a scale to which no low limit can be justly assigned, so that there is good reason to expect, under the continuance of favorable influences, a very considerable elevation of the negro race, as men. And it is our belief that such improvement is to be wrought out very much through their relation to our own Southern States. Still we know not that it is other than an unauthorized assumption to suppose that they can under any combination of circumstances ever be restored to the physical, intellectual, and social condition of the highest European standard. And hopeful as we are concerning the gradual elevation of the masses of mankind of all varieties, under the great ameliorating agencies of Christian-

ity and modern civilization, till this and every other race shall attain the best standard of which it is susceptible, we have little expectation of their fully recovering the structural symmetry, cuticular texture, complexional beauty, and ornamental locks, which in their pristine state distinguished, we may believe,

“Adam the goodliest man of men since born  
His sons, and fairest of her daughters Eve.”

But, however this may be, it is clear that observations are altogether too incomplete to authorize dogmatism either way on this incidental point. And it is still more obvious that even if negroes should in the future, however by favorable influences elevated in the human scale, always continue negroes, it will furnish no necessary proof that they always have been. They may have been developed downwards, and yet never be allowed in all respects to redevelop upwards. The possibilities of the future, apart from revealed sanctions, constitute however a mere speculation, with which it is no appropriate concern of scientific investigation to amuse or perplex itself. Its proper sphere is *the actual*, and in that sphere the hypothesis of absolute permanence of type through all past time finds no support. Facts abundant in the phenomena of variation among lower animals, and in the history of human varieties, and even significant tokens in the early Egyptian monuments, array themselves invincibly against the notion of unvarying continuance of the White and Black, and all other races, as they now are, from the very dawn of human existence.

And Nature, in reply to the interrogatory of science, returns a distinct negative to each branch of the unvarying, primordial-type proposition.

Having thus scrutinized, as proposed, the main arguments adduced by the supporters of the diversity doctrine, and found them unsubstantial and delusive, we proceed briefly to present the chief considerations which satisfy us of the specific unity of the human family. Such considerations, in addition to many already incidentally adduced, are, 1st, affiliation

of language; 2d, Discernible processes of Distribution; 3d, Physical, physiological, and psychological Correspondences among men of all varieties; and 4th, The doctrines of the Bible. Our limits admit of the merest sketch of evidence under these several heads.

The proof from affiliated language, in spite of suggestions to the contrary thrown out by Agassiz and others, is really decisive of the question of the common origin of the tribes of our race. It being plainly incredible that among the infinitely diversified combinations of sound, of which the human organs are every where capable, systematic coincidences in the structure of words and sentences among different people should endlessly occur by mere accident. It is vain also to attribute this agreement to the natural tendency of organs similarly constructed. No unprejudiced man in his senses can be made to believe that while the Greek machinery for utterance evolved the word "*απτος*," to express what the English and American apparatus for speech denotes by "*bread*," and the Latin organs of sound suggested by "*panis*," all widely distinct, and especially the last utterly unlike the other two, the French mouth should have developed, solely by the correspondence of its structure to that of the old Roman, the articulation "*pain*," for the identical thing. Every mind immediately discerns that the French word is really the Latin adopted and slightly changed, and so in a thousand instances.

The occurrence of a few such coincidences in any two tongues shows manifestly some connection between the people speaking them; and the appearance of a great many proves a very close connection, as in the case of the Italian, French, &c., with the Latin. But when besides corresponding words, the very mode of arranging the elementary sounds to produce words is found coincident in two languages, and the method of varying words in expressing the relation of things, is discovered to be mainly the same, not only is a close connection between those nations indubitably proved; but it is distinctly shown that their two classes of utterance are pervaded by a



common contrivance, and therefore emanated from one mental influence, that they are in fact parallel streams, flowing from the same source. The radical consonantal arrangements so extensively prevailing for instance in the Latin and Greek, and the diffused parallelism of their declensions and conjugations, constitute the most reliable historical documents concerning their common ancestry. So in like manner with the French and English. Such exactly agreeing modes of uttering thought as "*L-homme-de-guerre*," and "*The-man-of-war*," pervading the two languages, are but part of the family likeness transmitted from the same parentage.

Thoroughly to explore the tongues of the earth is then the true way to determine the great question of *origin*, as a scientific question. But this is a laborious process not to be pursued without untiring patience, accumulated efforts and vast erudition. No wonder it is depreciated by the impatient, superficial, and unlearned theorists, claiming to be scientific, who can so easily substitute for it a few half observed appearances, a crude hypothesis, a bold utterance, and an abundant amount of dogmatism and denunciation; and by mere dint of defiant assertion palm it upon the prejudiced, the busy, and the credulous, as *science*.\*

"Languages," says Humboldt, "compared together and considered as objects of the natural history of the mind, and when separated into families according to the analogies existing in their internal structure, have become a rich source of historical knowledge; and this is probably one of the most brilliant results of modern study in the last sixty or seventy years. From the very fact of their being products of the intellectual force of mankind, they lead us, by means of the

\* This we are pained to see so largely exemplified in the rather highly endorsed pamphlet of Dr. Van Evrie. The earnest Southern tone which pervades it, we should be glad only to approve, but its vehement passion, incongruous topics, unauthorized assumptions, unsustained pledges, and altogether partial views, completely nullify its pretensions, as an evolution of science. While it is on the one hand clear to ordinary good-sense that the physiological researches of the Cuviers, Tribonds, and Owens, are not to be set aside by a few hasty unverified assertions, however boldly propounded, it is equally indubitable on the other that a good cause is not to be properly or effectually sustained by bad methods and untenable theories. And to commit the South to such methods and theories, is to place her at once in a false position.

elements of their organism, into an obscure distance, unreached by traditionary records. The comparative study of languages shows us that races now separated by vast tracts of land are allied together, and have migrated from one common primitive seat, it indicates the course and direction of all migrations, and, in tracing the leading epochs of development, recognizes, by means of the more or less changed structure of the language, in the permanence of certain forms, or in the more or less advanced distinction of the formative system, *which* race has retained most nearly the language common to all who had migrated from the general seat of origin."

"The largest field for such investigations into the ancient condition of language, and consequently into the period when the whole family of mankind was, in the strict sense of the word, to be regarded as *one living whole*, presents itself in the long chain of Indo-Germanic languages, extending from the Ganges to the Iberian extremity of Europe, and from Sicily to the North Cape.

"The same comparative study of languages leads us also to the native country of certain products, which from the earliest ages have constituted important objects of trade and barter. The Sanscrit names of genuine Indian products, as those of rice, cotton, spikenard, and sugar, have as we find, passed into the language of the Greeks, and, to a certain extent, even into those of Semitic origin.

"From these considerations and the examples by which they have been illustrated, the comparative study of languages appears an important rational means of assistance by which scientific and genuinely philological investigation, may lead to a generalization of views regarding the affinity of races, and their conjectural extension in various directions from one common point of radiation."\*

The processes thus indicated, originating in the sagacious intellect of Leibnitz, have been since pressed forward, and especially within the last two generations, with amazing industry and ability by the leading scientific linguists of the world. Adelung and Vater, Schlegel and Bopp, Rask and Guinon, William Von Humboldt and Lepsius, Gyarmathi and Schott, Furst and Delitzsch, Muller and Bunsen, &c., and most memorable of all, that noble example of devotion to learning, Alexander Costren, already mentioned, "who al-

\* Kosmos. Otte's Translation, vol. ii, p. 471-2.

though in delicate health, left his study, traveled for years alone in his sledge, through the snowy deserts of Siberia, coasted along the borders of the Polar Sea, lived for whole winters in caves of ice, or in the smoky huts of greasy Samoieds; then braved the sand-clouds of Mongolia, passed the Baikel, and returned from the frontiers of China to his duties as professor at Helsingfors, to die, after he had given to the world but a few specimens of his rich treasures.”\*

Some of the results reached by these thorough explorers, and attested by such sure witnesses, have been already referred to; we add a few others of striking character:—

“The evidence of language,” says Professor Max Muller, “is irrefragible, and it is the only evidence worth listening to, with regard to ante-historical periods. It would have been next to impossible to discover any traces of relationship between the swarthy nations of India and their conquerors, whether Alexander or Clive, but for the testimony borne by language. What authority would have been strong enough to persuade the Grecian army that their gods and their hero ancestors were the same as those of King Porus, or to convince the English soldier that the same blood was running in his veins and in those of the dark Bengalee? And yet there is not an English jury now-a-days which, after examining the hoary documents of language, would reject the claim of a common descent and a legitimate relationship between Hindu, Greek, and Teuton. Many words still live in India and in England that have witnessed the first separation of the Northern and Southern members of the Arian family; and these are witnesses not to be shaken by any cross-examination. The terms for God, for house, for father, mother, son, daughter, for dog and cow, for heart and tears, for axe and tree—identical in all the European idioms—are like the watch-words of soldiers. We challenge the seeming stranger; and whether he answer with the lips of a Greek, a German, or an Indian, we recognize him as one of ourselves. Though the historian may shake his head, though the physiologist may doubt, and the poet scorn the idea,—all must yield before the facts furnished by language.”

But the results of such investigations extend very far be-

\* Bunsen's Christianity and Mankind, vol. ii, p. 274,

yond the obvious affiliations in the several branches of the great Iranian stock.

"The heads," says Bunsen, "of the critical Hebrew school, Gesenius and Ewald, had thrown out a hint, that, by the reduction of the triliteral Hebrew roots to biliteral ones, (proposed already in the 17th century,) we might find strong reason to suspect a radical affinity between Hebrew and Sanscrit. Klaproth had pronounced, without reserve, that it was so. And in 1838-40, two masters of the Hebrew tongue, —Furst, of Leipsic, (himself a Jew,) and more especially Delitzsch, of Halle,—accepting the method adopted by Indo-Germanic scholars, maintained and exemplified the constant and undeniable analogy between Indo-Germanic and Semitic roots. . . . And Lepsius, and Dr. Charles Meyer, have established the fact beyond all doubt, that there exists an undeniable community of living roots between the two families. They have further shown that, in many instances, the Egyptian roots present the intermediate link between both, as well in words as in forms."

And Bunsen adds, from his own researches into the Babylonian, Egyptian, and other tongues:—

"If the Indo-European languages exhibit undeniable proof of the gradual extension of these races from the eastern part of Central Asia, the Semitic tongues present no less striking evidences of their being derived from the western part of the primitive seat of mankind. The range of the Semitic branch is less extended than that of the Iranian, but it forms a more compact and not less interesting mass. The Semitic tribes never extended into Europe, except by temporary incursions. They have, however, not lost their ground in Asia, Armenia excepted, and have penetrated into Africa, at various epochs, even in the historical times, in which, assuredly, no traces of Japetic origin are discernible. It is a fact which can be philologically proved, that the Semitic formation constitutes the groundwork of African languages, from the Mediterranean coast of Africa into the interior of that mysterious country, even beyond the equator, in an uninterrupted line."\*

And William von Humboldt extends this remark by a statement of singular interest, in connection with the origin of the Nigrito races of Polynesia and New Holland, of whom we have already spoken:—

\* Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. iii, pp. 172, 173.



"To judge correctly," he says, "of the Negro races in their pure form, we must always commence with the inhabitants of the Great Southern Continent; as between these and the brown races no direct contact is conceivable, and, according to their present condition, it is difficult to conceive any kind even of indirect connection. The remarkable fact, however, still remains, that many words in the languages of these races, although we certainly possess only a few of them, bear an evident likeness to the words of the South Sea Islands."

The languages of the latter, from critical examination, are classed by Muller, Bunsen, &c., in that vast circle of non-Iranian and non-Semitic dialects to which they give the general name, Juranian. This, it will be remembered, is the immense sweep of kindred families to the investigation of whose tongues Castren so heroically devoted himself.

Of this great assemblage, Muller, after a most elaborate analysis, affirms two nuclei may be distinguished, a Northern and a Southern; and of these, still further back, a coalescence in one common form. "Here," he adds, "where the differences between the Juranian languages cease, the first stamina of the ancient Semitic and Arian are found to converge toward the same centre of life. Radicals applied to certain definite but material meanings in common by all Juranian dialects, belong to this primitive era, and some of them can even now be proved the common property of the Juranian, the Semitic, and the Arian branches."

And with these Bunsen has been enabled, by the abundant data furnished in Schoolcraft's elaborate collection, in the most undoubting manner, to connect the dialects of the North American Indians. "The linguistic data," he declares, "thus furnished, combined with the traditions and customs, and particularly with the system of mnemonic writing, (first revealed in Schoolcraft's work,) enable me to say that the Asiatic origin of all these tribes is as fully proved as the unity of family among themselves."

Thus are all the languages of the earth, however, at first view, apparently dissociated and incongruous, traceable to

one original, and by consequence, all human tribes have proceeded from one centre, and descended from one parentage.

And the unity thus traced, remarks the copiously furnished author just quoted, "is not simply a physical, external one, it is that of thought, wisdom, arts, science, and civilization. By facts still more conclusive than the succession of strata in geology, comparative philology proves what our religious records postulate, that the civilization of mankind is not a patchwork of incoherent fragments, not an inorganic complex of various courses of development, starting from numberless beginnings, flowing in isolated beds, and destined only to disappear in order to make room for other tribes running the same course in monotonous rotation. Far beyond all other documents, there is preserved in language that sacred tradition of primeval thought and art which connects all the historical families of mankind, not only as brethren by descent, but each as the depositary of a phasis of one and the same development. In language are deposited the primordial sparks of that celestial fire, which from a once bright centre of civilization has streamed over the inhabited earth, and which now already forms a galaxy round the globe, a chain of light from pole to pole."\*

Immediately connected with these demonstrative utterances of scientific comparative philology, are the indications of the same general truth furnished by the traceable processes of human distribution. The relation of many of the tongues of the earth to each other, constitutes as we have seen a very sure guidance to some of the otherwise undiscoverable traces of paths along which tribes of men have trod, in wandering from their primitive Asiatic home to distant regions. There is much in the affiliation of dialects, and in the observed, relative development of speech, to indicate, in the words of Baron Humboldt, "the cause and direction of all migrations," these however are not the only means by which man may be traced in his farthest roving.

\* Bunsen's *Christianity and Mankind*, vol. iv, pp. 112-26.

There are highways on this globe, constructed by higher than human art, whose courses, though definite as a planet's path, have remained as undetected, till mapped by modern skill, and that chiefly under the guidance of one of our distinguished countrymen, an American and a Southerner. And those highways give tokens, engraved by a finger whose marks are equally inaffaceable and undeniable, of the human travelers they have borne to remotest climes.

The great streams that flow unceasingly through the ocean, constitute such highways; and the atmospheric currents above the sea furnish an unerring locomotive power more ancient than the human race.

This is the testimony of Lieut. Maury, in reply to certain queries proposed by Mr. Schoolcraft. Alluding in the first place to the use made by Col. Hamilton Smith in his "Natural History of the Human Species," of the Mexican legend of "*Seven Caves*," communicated by Montezuma to Cortez, in relation to a traditionary connection between the Aztec race and the nations of the Old World.

"The colonel had a stronger case than he imagined, in conjecturing that the Chichimacs might have been Aleutians, and that '*Caves*,' if not denoting islands, might have referred to Canves. The Aleutians of the present day actually live in caves or subterranean apartments. They are the most bestial of the species, in their habits copying after the seal and the whale.

"These islands grow no wood. For their canves, fishing implements, and *cave*-hold utensils, the natives depend upon the drift wood which is cast ashore, much of which is *camphor* wood. Another link in the chain, which is growing quite strong, of evidence which for years I have been seeking, in confirmation of a Gulf-stream, near there, and *which runs from the shores of China over towards the north-west coast.*"

Next, in reply to the question whether the Pacific and Polynesian waters could have been navigated in early times:

"Yes; if you had a supply of provisions, you could run down the trades on a log.

"There is no part of the world where nature would tempt savage man more strongly to launch out upon the open sea

with his bark, however frail ; then, there is the island in the distance to attract and allure ; and the next step would be to fit out an expedition. . . The native finds a hollow log. This is split in two ; and a dam made across either end with knead of clay. He puts in a few cocoa-nuts, a calabash of water, breaks a green branch thick with foliage, sticks it up as a sail, and goes before the wind at the rate of three or four miles the hour. I have seen them actually do this, their little fleets like 'Birnam wood coming to Dunsinane,' by water. But by some mishap, in the course of time, this frail bark misses the island or falls to leeward ; the only chance then is to submit to the winds and waves to go where they will bear.

"But the South Sea Islander would soon get above vessels with clay bows and mud sterns. As fissures in bread-trays, in negro cabins of the south, are sewed up with white-oak splits, so the Marquesas Islanders make large canoes out of little slats of wood sewed together with cords of Cocoa-nut fibre, the holes being puttied up with clay. These canoes will sometimes hold twenty rowers.

"In the Pacific, between  $25^{\circ}$  and  $30^{\circ}$  south, it is easy for such vessels to sail in any direction between north round by west, to south-west and north of the equator, to the 25th or 30th parallel. It is likewise easy for such rude vessels to sail in any course between north-west round by the west to south. It is difficult to get to the eastward within the trade-wind region."

Again, in reply to the inquiry whether, before the invention of the compass, long voyages were possible :

"Such *chance* voyages were not only possible, but more than probable. When we take into consideration the position of North America with regard to Asia, and of New Holland, with regard to Africa, and with the winds and currents of the ocean, it would have been more remarkable that America should not have been peopled from Asia, or New Holland from Africa, than that they should have been.

"Captain Ray, of the whale ship *Superior*, fished two years ago in Behrings Straits. He saw canoes going from one continent to the other. . . Along the course of the 'gulf-stream,' from the shores of China, already alluded to, westerly winds prevail ; and we have well authorized instances in which these two agents have brought Japanese mariners in disabled vessels to the coasts of America.

"In the Indian Ocean an immense surface of water is ex-



posed to the heat of the torrid zone, without any escape, as it becomes expanded, but to the south. Accordingly we have here the genesis of another 'gulf stream,' which runs along the east coast of Africa . . . bearing to the south of New-Holland.

"There was then, in the early ages, the island of Madagascar, to invite the African out with his canoe, his raft or more substantial vessel. There was this current to bear him along at first, at the rate of nearly, if not quite, one hundred miles a day, and by the time the current began to grow weak, it would have borne him into the region of westerly winds, which, with the aid of the current, would finally waft him to the southern shores of New Holland. Increasing and multiplying here, he would travel north to meet the sun, and in the course of time he would extend himself over to the other island as Papua and the like.

"When we look at the Pacific, its islands, the winds and currents, and consider the facilities there that nature has provided for drifting savage man with his rude implements of navigation about, we shall see that there the inducements held out to him to try the sea are powerful. With the bread-fruit and the cocoa-nut, man's natural barrels thereof of beef and bread, and the calabash, his natural water cask, he had all the stores for a long voyage already at hand."\*

Upon the first part of this, and other particulars of like character, Mr. Schoolcraft remarks, "Thus we have traditional gleams of a foreign origin of the race of North American Indians. . . . They point directly to an Oriental origin. Such has from the first been inferred. At whatever point the investigation has been made, the eastern hemisphere has been found to contain the physical and mental prototypes of the race. Language, mythology, religious dogmas, the very style of architecture, and their calendar, as far as it is developed, point to that fruitful source of human nationality and dispersion."†

And in relation to other points suggested by Maury, bearing upon the question of the diffusion alike of men and of the lower animals, much information is given by Lyell. We can make room for only one fact. "Kotzebue, when investigat-

\* Schoolcraft, vol. i, p. 23.    † Ibid.

ing the coral isles of Rodock, at the eastern extremity of the Caroline Isles, became acquainted with a person by the name of Kadu, who was a native of Ulea, an isle 1,500 miles distant, from which he had been drifted with a party.”\*

Such are the paths along which population has been conducted to our globe’s remotest extremity. Thus—

“Wise to promote whatever end he means,  
God opens fruitful nature’s various scenes.”

And thus has he conducted to every region children of Adam, and diffused

“Soul, passion, intellect; till blood of man  
Through every artery of nature ran;  
O’er eastern islands poured its quickening stream,  
Caught the warm crimson of the western beam;  
Beneath the burning line made fountains start,  
In the dry wilderness of Afric’s heart;  
And through the torpid North, with genial heat,  
Taught love’s exhilarating pulse to beat;  
Till the great sun in his perennial round,  
Man, of all climes, the restless native found.”

This is not poetry merely. It is sound philosophy. And it opens at once the next branch of evidence respecting the family relationship between the most widely separated tribes of man; that presented in the mental phenomena and physiological characteristics of every variety of human kind.

On the latter and lower, but in some respects more obviously presented point, in spite of all the circumstantial diversities urged by a certain class of observers, the most searching investigations have issued in what amounts in fact to a strict demonstration of specific unity.

Facts connected with the phenomena of hybridity approach very closely this demonstrative character. Questions indeed are raised respecting these phenomena, and assertions not a few most energetically advanced. But facts will yield neither to perplexed speculation, nor to headlong boldness. Still less can they be expected to submit, when the challenging parties are themselves at issue.

Dr. Van Evrie and Dr. Nott agree in contending that mu-

\* Elements of Geology, vol. iii, p. 92.

lattoes are strictly hybrids; but that they differ quite widely in regard to the general laws of nature respecting hybrids. The latter maintains that in the hybridity which takes place "between proximate species," as he holds varieties of men to be, although the early generations appear more delicate, yet "prolificacy is unlimited."\* The former affirms, with characteristic but unverified confidence, "*the mulatto of the fourth generation is as sterile as the mule of the first.*"† These opposite statements, which it is almost self-evident neither of the learned gentlemen could on his own side substantiate, they may be left to reconcile, meanwhile the long-admitted and unquestionable fact remains a potent verity, that mixed races of men, as the Guiquas of South Africa, descended from the Dutch and Hottentots, the Cafusos of Brazil, and similar mestizoes elsewhere, from Negroes and Indians, the Papuans of New Guinea, &c., from Negroes and Malayans. And the Mulattoes and Creoles of the West Indies, and of our own country, not only exist in great numbers, but according to wide observation, continue, wherever circumstances permit, rapidly to multiply. From our own late census returns we learn that "the mulattoes in the United States, numbering in 1850, 405,751, are about *one eighth* as numerous as the blacks, and the free mulattoes are *more than half* the number of free blacks."‡

It is one thing then, and may serve a purpose, to speak of mulattoes as "mules," but it is altogether a different thing scientifically to establish their hybridity. And even if something approaching it could be proved, it would be nothing more than might be expected from the wide deviation, from the white standard solely developed and perpetuated in the Negro; and would be therefore no satisfactory evidence of specified diversity. But real hybridity in the case cannot be proved. The fact quoted from our last census is of itself decisive. But further:

"If we search the whole world," says Prichard, "we shall probably not find one instance of an intermediate tribe produced between any two distinct species, *ascertained to be such.*"§

\*Types, p. 376. † Int. Essay, p. 29. ‡ Cen. Rep., 1850, p. 82. § Nat. Hist. p. 12.

"I cannot share the opinion," says M. de Candolle, "that between species of the same genera, hybrid species may be found."\*

"I have never yet seen a hybrid plant," says Mr. T. A. Knight, "capable of affording offspring, which has been proved with any thing like satisfactory evidence, to have sprung from two originally distinct species.†"

"There is no satisfactory proof," says Lyell, "that a single permanent species has ever been produced by hybridity."‡

And Professor Wagner of Germany is said to have shown that the sterility of hybrid animals is generally secured by an organic impediment. It is plain that such a law in nature is needed towards preserving the order of creation, as, in the language of Prichard, "if hybrid races were produced and continued without impediment, the organized world would soon present a scene of universal confusion."

Facts then are all against the notion of mixed races among men being hybrids. They are but intermediate varieties. Physiologically, man is really proved to be one. This is the latest utterance of perhaps the master physiologist now living, Professor Owen.

"With regard to the number of known species of apes, it is not without interest to observe that, as the generic form of the quadrumana approaches the bimanous order, they are represented by fewer species. The unity of the human species is demonstrated by the constancy of those osteological and dental characters, brought to view in investigating the corresponding structural particulars in the higher quadrumana. Man is the sole species of his genus, the sole representative of his order, and in reference both to the unity of the human species, and to the fact of man being the latest as he is the highest of all animal forms upon our planet, the interpretation of God's works coincides with what has been revealed to us as to our own origin and zoological relation, in his word."§

It is not then too much to say, in the words of Prof. Muller,

\* *Essai Elementaire, &c.*, 8me partie. † *Observations on Hybrids*, p. 253.

‡ *Elements of Geology*, vol. iii, p. 14

§ *Lecture bef. Brit. Ass. for adv. of Science*, Liverpool, Sept. 1854. Littell. Nov., 1854, p. 290.



“From a physiological point of view, we may speak of varieties of men, no longer of races. Man is a species, created once, and divided into none of its varieties by specific distinctions. In fact the common origin of the Negro and the Greek admits not of rational doubt.”

The mental phenomena to which we have alluded, if furnishing proof less palpable to the senses, are in their specific correspondences, when carefully examined, equally decisive of essential oneness in mankind.

Vast as is the interval between the towering intellectual proportions of a Shakespeare, a Milton, a Bacon, or a Newton, and those of the groveling creatures known as Esquimaux or Fuegians, Hottentots or Guineans, there are not only countless links binding them to the same common kind, but certain great features making manifest their family relationship.

A ratiocinative and logical faculty marks man wherever he is found, and a creative genius varying with circumstances. On every soil and beneath every sky, is he characterized by the sense of responsibility which renders government possible, and binds him to the moral system of the universe. And the outworking of this element of his being, in some form of religious belief and custom, is coterminous with his diffusion.

Against this it is vain to urge, as indicating specific difference, the favorite allegation of diversity advocates, that the brain of the Indian, &c., is comparatively small, and that no instance can be adduced of a negro who has made high attainments in literature or philosophy.

Dr. Morton himself teaches, in an extract already given, that the Indian brain has, by peculiar habit of exercise, been in some tribes considerably enlarged. A fact indeed falling in with the commonly observed tendency of all human tissues to enlargement, within moderate limits, through a given process of action. Size of brain, however, at any rate, is no final test of mind. The quality of material must surely be quite as important as its quantity. Dr. Wyman testifies that other heads in Boston were notoriously larger than Daniel Webster's.

To demand instances of superior intellect among races long

degraded, is then, plainly unreasonable, and amounts in truth to a begging of the question, by the opponents of unity. Can they furnish such instances among the forty or fifty million of native Slavonian Serfs, spread over the vast plains of European Russia? Instances can certainly be adduced, though they are rare, of pure-blooded negroes making very considerable attainments in high learning. J. H. B. Latrobe, Esq., of Baltimore, has described one whom he knew, who became a quite profound mathematician. The census returns also exhibit some singular statistics, as to the education and employment of many negroes, alike in New Orleans and New York. And the sound judgment, good feeling, and steady principle which good planters so often discover in their well-trained slaves, certainly speak favorably of their position in the wide range of humanity. Moreover our laws themselves, by assuming the rational and responsible nature of the negro, and regulating thereby their important sanctions, bear testimony, incontestible, to an universal conviction on the subject. The truth unquestionably is, that while habit and other causes have greatly modified and extensively degraded the one mental, as well as the one bodily constitution of the greater part of mankind, the lowest tribes are not only improvable in the latter respect as well as in the former, but the mind in its most degraded state, by unmistakable movements, vindicates its high connections. How strikingly does the emotional nature of man every where respond to the stroke of grief or the touch of delight! Smiles and tears, laughter and groans, may be witnessed equally in the hovel and the palace, in the ice-burrow of the oil-fed Samoied, and the star-canopied sand-home of the half-starved Burman. And there is something in this single fact more convincing than whole volumes of materialistic speculation. The great poet of mankind has fitly spoken the truth in words that can never die :

“One touch of nature makes the whole world kin.”

To this entire argument from nature, conclusive as it is, the Bible sets the seal of revealed verity. It not only affirms in the plainest terms that God “hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth,”\* but it traces them

\* Acts xvii, 26.

down from one created pair and one reserved household. It not only makes known, as its supreme, all-comprehending disclosure, one "Son of man," at once the "Second Adam," and the "Lord from heaven," mysteriously accomplishing a great scheme of mediation for mankind, but it addresses its encouragement and admonitions, its precepts and its promises, with indiscriminating benignity, and commands them to be conveyed with universal comprehensiveness to every variety and every grade of human creatures, as constituting one great brotherhood. Children of one vast family. So thoroughly indeed is the doctrine of an actual blood-relationship between all human beings interwoven with the highest announcements and most practical inculcations of revelation, that it may be pronounced impracticable to reject the one and retain the other. We see not how it is possible to recognize ordinary fairness, far less inspired veracity, in the fundamental lessons of Scripture, and yet reject their uniform teaching concerning the co-ordinate relations of men towards each other, and to their common Father and one Mediator.

Accordingly we find the most frivolous air of levity, the bitterest tone of mockery, and the fiercest spirit of hostility, directed against the belief of any thing supernatural in the Bible, associated with the latest phase of the diversity theory. And at the same time, with strange inconsistency, the attempt is made to represent the issue, so far as revelation is concerned, as a mere question of interpretation, like those involved in the solution of astronomical and geological facts under their phenomenal instead of their scientific relations.

This alternative, Dr. Van Evre has the prudence from the first to announce, and his more copious co-laborers in the cause, mingle it in part with their dire denunciations, but it cannot be admitted. Man, his relations, his duties, his prospects, his origin, and his destiny, constitute the essential, all-pervading topic of revelation. And there is no interpretation that can change these in the manner proposed, without rending the whole fabric to its base and scattering the dishonored fragments to the winds.

In the Bible, as in common parlance, there is no necessary conflict between the incidental mention of natural events according

to their appearances, and the scientific realities of the case. Not so however with its account of the position and relations of the human family. If its historical, preceptive, and spiritual exhibitions so distinctly conveyed, be not reliable, it is discredited throughout. There is in fact nothing left to credit.

Could science necessitate such interpretation, it would really prove Christianity a fable, and revelation an imposture ; Bacon a dupe, Newton a driveler, and the sober judgment of the Christian world an insane infatuation or a childish delusion.

Of all this, however, there is, as we have seen, happily not the remotest danger. Science really speaks here as every where, in harmony with Scripture.

Truth now, as heretofore, is found like its Author, one.

---

ART. V.—HISTORY OF THE ORIGIN, FORMATION AND ADOPTION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES, *with notices of its principal framers.* By GEORGE TICKNOR CURTIS. In two volumes. Vol. I. Harper & Brothers, New York, 1854.

No subject can deserve more attention from the American reader, than the history of the Constitution of the United States. Every citizen is, by the structure of our institutions, the expositor of that charter. No law can be framed by Congress under its provisions, which does not, directly or indirectly, affect his interests, no less than the exercise of his political power. Consequently every book, written intelligently upon this subject, possesses a marked value. Lord Bolingbroke has well said that “when histories and historical memorials abound, even those that are false serve to the discovery of truth. Inspired by different passions, and contrived for opposite purposes, they contradict ; and, contradicting, they convict one another.” The light of truth is elicited in the clashing of opinions, and knowledge is increased, and our view of the whole system made more accurate, by observing it from different points.



This is especially true of all writings, which are political in their character, or which relate to questions dividing the opinions of parties. Few or none can write an impartial history of the causes of a war, while they are engaged in the campaign, among the actual combatants. Our reasonable expectations are fully gratified, when the facts are truly presented in a political history. If we have right upon our side, and the premises of the author are correctly stated, we may give him all credit for his candor and learning even while we differ from his conclusions. And although we would more highly esteem a history that commended itself to our judgment by its conclusions, no less than by its narrative, yet, if we are satisfied that the author expresses in his work an honest conviction, it is our duty to accord him just praise for the manner in which his labor has been performed.

We believe that the history of the Constitution by Mr. Curtis is entitled to commendation, for its learning, earnestness, and candor; and although we may find occasion to dispute the soundness of some of the more important political lessons which are taught in his volume, we shall endeavor to perform that duty with the amenity due to the largeness of his purpose, to the purity of his intent, and to the dignity of his style. We shall remember always that his work was performed with the sanction of Daniel Webster, and in partial exposition of the theories maintained by that great statesman. We shall respectfully discuss argument that accords with the tenor of the public life and opinions of the Massachusetts Senator, whose great talents so long adorned the Congress of the United States. But we shall not forget that we are sustained in our differences of opinion by that other noble intellect, whose fame will increase always as the years advance, and whose memory is precious to the people of the Southern States, and truly honored throughout the length and breadth of the land.

The political theory of the author, to which we have alluded, is made apparent in his first chapter, and pervades the whole current of his after narrative. We shall briefly examine its de-

velopment. He calls attention to the fact, that the "English language was almost universally spoken in the colonies, although they had no political connection, and were each, more or less, under the direct control of the mother country. They were under provincial, proprietary, and charter governments. New Hampshire, New Jersey, Virginia, the Carolinas, and Georgia, were provinces, having no other form of government than the commissions and instructions issued by the Crown to the governors appointed over them. The proprietorships of Maryland, Pennsylvania, and Delaware, conferred a larger privilege upon those to whom they were granted. The authority of the proprietaries, and of their legislative subordinates, was restrained only by the condition that their acts should substantially conform to the attainment of the ends for which the grants were made, and be in accordance with the sovereignty of the mother country. The charter governments of Massachusetts, Rhode Island and Connecticut, were controlled by written constitutions. In all the colonies there existed local legislatures, of which one branch was composed of representatives, chosen directly by the people. The author, after setting out at large these peculiarities in the structure of the colonial governments, states the undoubted fact, that "these colonies had no direct political connection with each other before the Revolution commenced, but that each was a distinct community, with its own separate political organization, and without any power of legislation from any but its own inhabitants; that, as political communities, and upon the principles of their organizations, they possessed no power of forming any union among themselves, for any purpose whatever, without the sanction of the Crown or Parliament of England." But—and in the next paragraph—he asserts the proposition upon which his implied argument subsequently hinges:—"The free and independent power of forming a union among themselves, for objects and purposes common to them all, which was denied to their colonial condition by the principles of the English Constitution, was one of the chief powers asserted and developed by the Revolution; and they were enabled to effect this union, as a revolutionary right and measure, by the fortunate circumstances of their origin, which

made the people of the different colonies, in several important senses, *one people*." This proposition is further developed in the next page, in which he quotes from a letter written by Dr. Franklin to the Massachusetts Assembly, dated July 7th, 1773, in which the *Union* of the colonies is referred to as a political necessity. It is yet more clearly expressed in his account of the assembling of the delegates from the various colonies, who met in Philadelphia on the 5th of September, 1774. For, although the action of that Congress, in so far as it went, demonstrates very clearly that there was at that time no purpose to obliterate the separate existence of the colonial forms of government, yet the author is apparently more content to accept the reservation attached to the ultimate resolve of the convention, than the inference supplied by its direct conduct. In that convention, as soon as the choice of officers had taken place, it was necessary to determine the method of voting, because some of the colonies had a larger number of delegates present than others. The author states that the opinion was advanced in the convention, that the colonial governments were at an end, and that all America was thrown into one mass; and that therefore the *people* ought to be considered as represented in that body. For this reason it was urged that the voting should be by polls. In a note, it is stated, on the authority of the elder Adams, that this doctrine was held by Patrick Henry.

In a strictly legal sense there was great force in the view thus taken. The author is undoubtedly right in the opinion previously given, that there was no power in the provincial, proprietary, or charter government to delegate any authority to such a Congress, as was then assembled. Indeed that Congress had not met under the sanctions of any recognized law. The delegates were not in any case appointed with the approbation, or consent of the constituted authorities. In some of the States they were selected by the popular body of the local assembly, and in others by conventions, or committees collected for that purpose. Patrick Henry might therefore well have argued that a body which met without the sanction of colonial authority, could not act as if it represented the political organization of the colonies. And contemplating as he did the state of revolution into which they were about

to enter, it was perhaps in his view desirable that the delegates should act as the representatives of the whole people of the colonies, and so practically destroy the colonial governments, which more immediately represented the abuses, from which they were desirous of escaping.

But the convention, whether controlled by the moderate purpose of restoring harmony with the mother country, or with a purpose of preserving that independence of colonial action, which was even then endangered by the preponderance of the large colonies, determined otherwise, and recognized the individuality of the colonies in their state of incipient revolution, by providing that each colony should have only one vote. We do not think that the reason given by the convention for this course, namely, that it was not possessed of, nor able to procure information concerning the importance of each colony, was in any sense, as intimated by the author, a qualification of its acknowledgments of this separate colonial existence. For the cause assigned did not tend even to the support of the theory, which is alleged to have been entertained by Patrick Henry, that the colonial governments were and ought to have been superseded by the revolutionary convention of delegates from the people of the colonies. It only reserves the question, as to the relation, influence, and position which the colonies should hold in any subsequent convention, assembled to direct their colonial affairs. While, therefore, we may admit, with the author, that this first Congress, notwithstanding its exercise of legislative functions, scarce rose to the character of a government, yet we cannot conceal from ourselves that its recognition of the separate political existence of the colonies was the key to the proceedings of subsequent conventions,—to the formation of the articles of confederation, and to the adoption of the Constitution of the United States.

The Congress, to which we have just referred, sat from the 5th September to the 26th October, 1774. It recommended that another Congress assemble in Philadelphia on the 10th May, 1775. The delegates were chosen in some of the colonies by the popular branches of their several Legislatures, and were afterwards confirmed in their appointments by conventions called for that pur-



pose; or they were elected by conventions of the people, held in the various colonies. On their assembling at the specified time, the rule adopted by the former Congress was adhered to, without discussion, and each colony had one vote. By this proceeding the argument of Patrick Henry, that the separate unities of the colonial system had ceased to exist, was again negatived; the only change ingrafted upon the colonial form of the several governments being that the delegates practically asserted the independence of the colonies, as separate communities of people, by assuming to exercise authority for the common good, without warrant from the powers created under the several colonial grants and charters. The delegates to this Congress, with the exception of those from New York, had been appointed prior to the battle of Lexington; and they found themselves somewhat unexpectedly called upon to take the initiative in the struggle which was about to ensue. Their powers were of necessity revolutionary. They exercised functions, which the colonial legislatures and conventions had never anticipated. There remained in the colonies no regal authorities to whom an appeal for other powers could properly be made. But, in the exercise of their powers, the delegates still acted for the colonies, which they represented, and gave their votes as if the political unity of each colony remained as before. In the exercise of their military authority, they commissioned, on the 15th June, 1775, George Washington, in the name of the United Colonies, and under this name they entered boldly into the war. One of their earliest steps was to recommend to all the colonies the arming and training of the militia, and its enrolment into regiments. It was considered that the right of Congress to call the forces thus enrolled into the field was subject, however, to the consent of such authorities, as might be recognized as presiding over the domestic affairs of each colony. In addition to this and other kindred measures, it is noticed by Mr. Curtis that several applications were made to this Congress concerning the proper exercise of the powers of government in the several colonies; and he seems to attach great importance to the inference afforded by the superintendence, which seems to have been thus practically conceded. But the text of the author shows that the replies were of the nature of advices, and not of commands; and that Con-

gress was really appealed to as the only tribunal whose decision was advanced with sufficient circumstance of authority to warrant any resolute purpose in the colonial legislatures.

We cannot say that we think Mr. Curtis is right in his conclusion from these facts, "that the power of the several colonies had previously to the Declaration of Independence established a national government of a revolutionary character, which undertook to act, and did act in the name and with the general consent of the inhabitants of the country." Because it is very evident, from the author's own showing, that the Congress was elected before any decisive step had been taken by the mother country, or by the Colonies, and that the primary object seems to have been the adoption of some satisfactory course, which would secure the rights of the Colonies, in their continued subordination to the mother country. The people of the several colonies did not in any sense design to establish a *national* government, nor did their quasi government, when it came into existence, assume a national character. It was literally a federation league, with assumed power. Nor did the Congress next undertake to act in the name of the inhabitants of all the territory, which had been previously embraced by the colonial limits. It acted for the people of the "United Colonies," as they were described in the commission to General Washington. And although it is true that State governments were not formed until the union of the colonies had taken place, yet it is equally true that this union of the colonies, established by the Congress, was a revolutionary measure, instead or from necessity,\* which did not affect the loyal relation of the colonies to each other, when they assumed the rank and dignity of States. For unless this is admitted, the federal compact afterwards formed would have been wholly unnecessary, and Congress would have had no need to petition the State Legislatures to invest their delegates with such powers as would enable them to subscribe the Articles of Confederation. Nor, if the author's views of the powers of Congress were correct, would he have been constrained to narrate the painful difficulties which Washington encountered when he attempted to organize the army by the assistance of the provincial authorities. Instead of being few and powerless, as it really

was, Congress, representing the unity of the American people, was at that time, if Mr. Curtis' argument is carried to its legitimate conclusion, the uncontrolled master of the resources of all the provinces, and could have exercised an authority as absolute as was possessed by the Legislative Assembly in France, after the imprisonment of Louis the Sixteenth.

The author admits that "there seems no reason upon principles, why they should not have adopted decrees to be their own immediate agents, and by their own direct force." But he says that "a practical difficulty embarrassed and almost annulled this theoretical and rightful power. The government of the Congress rested on no definite legislative faculty." But we may well ask how a practical difficulty existed, if Congress represented the sovereignty of the whole people? What deficiency was there in its legislative faculty, if it was the sole power in the land, both in theory and right? Does not the author abandon his whole position, when he says that a resolution or vote in this Congress, "constituted only a voluntary compact, to which *the people of each colony* pledged themselves, by their delegates, *as to a treaty*, but which depended for its observance entirely on the patriotism and good faith of the colony itself?" It is true that he proceeds afterwards to reassert his first doctrine, for he says that "no means existed of compelling obedience from a delinquent colony; and the government was not one which could operate directly upon individuals, unless it assumed the full exercise of powers, derived from the revolutionary objects at which it aimed. These powers were not assumed and exercised to their full extent, for reasons peculiar to the situation of the country, and to the character, habits, and feelings of the people."

But the author, embarrassed by the difficulties of this extreme position, again qualifies his theory in the following language, which we must be permitted to say expresses to our mind the exact relation of the Congress to the colonies, though the view is different from that which the author seems to have maintained in his previous argument.

He says "the people of the colonies had indeed sent their delegates to a Congress to consult and determine upon the

measures necessary to be adopted in order to assert and maintain their rights. But they had never been accustomed to any machinery of government or legislation, other than that existing in their own separate jurisdictions. They had imparted to the Congress no proper legislative authority, and no civil powers, except those of a revolutionary character.

This revolutionary government was therefore entirely without civil executive officers, fundamental laws, or control over individuals; and the union of the colonies, *as far as a union had taken place, was one from which any colony could withdraw at any time without violating any legal obligations.* If any colony could thus legally withdraw, we ask of what value was the theoretical and rightful power in the Congress to act for all the people of all the colonies?

As it is our main purpose to comment upon the political theories of Mr. Curtis, as developed in his able work, we shall notice the chapters succeeding those already commented on in their regular order, resuming the leading views of the author, at a point where it will be seen that it is still more apparent.

The reader will find a note of several pages at the close of the third chapter concerning the authorship of the Declaration of Independence. Some difficulties have lately arisen with regard to the precise action of the committee, which was intrusted with preparing the Declaration of Independence. There are some discrepancies between the account given by John Adams in 1822, of the history of this instrument, and in his autobiography published in 1850, and the account given by Mr. Jefferson. The commentary made upon these discrepancies by the author is perfectly just; and full credit is rendered to Mr. Jefferson for his authorship of the Declaration. The whole note is instructive, but it is too long to allow of its presentation in these pages.

Mr. Curtis says, in the opening of his fourth chapter, that the Declaration of Independence did not change in any way the form of the revolutionary government, but that it terminated all hopes of accommodation with the mother country,



and made the war a political necessity. He remarks, however, that this action resulted in the enfranchisement of the colonies, and that their erection into States followed before any defined national system was established, and that State sovereignty then became, and has continued a fruitful source of embarrassment to the operations of the government. We do not think that the order in which the formation of the States and the national government occurred, can be regarded as a misfortune. Entertaining the theory, which controls our mind, we can see in this succession of events only the development of the legal relations in which the colonies stand to each other. We might indeed well argue that these relations, which were the result of circumstances beyond the control of the colonies, tended necessarily to the formation of a constitution, precisely adapted to the wants of a country so widely extended and with such diverse interests. But the views of the author on this subject are not expressed at sufficient length to require an extended notice of them.

The account given in the fourth chapter of the difficulties attending the reconstruction of the army, after the evacuation of New York by the American forces in 1776, is both lucid and instructive. No other history of the kind has presented the difficulties in a form as easily understood. The narration of the circumstances, under which Congress on the 27th December, 1776, invested Washington with powers little short of a dictatorship, is especially deserving of attention. The letter of Robert Morris to the commander-in-chief shows with what implicit confidence a power nearly unlimited was bestowed upon a citizen trained to arms. History does not show another well authenticated instance, in which the pledge given by the soldier, who accepted such a trust, at the time of his investiture with power, was fulfilled with such literal fidelity. The action of Congress in its bestowal of these large privileges upon the commander-in-chief amounted practically to a declaration of martial law within the limits of the colonies. It was the exercise of an extraordinary legislative power, and was so contended for and resisted at the

time, as is shown by the opposition made to the exercise of the military authority so gained by the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, in 1777, when General Washington issued his famous proclamation, counter to that which had been issued by Sir William Howe.

On the 7th of October, 1777, the Congress resumed the consideration of the Articles of Confederation, which had been waiting its action since the 8th of April in the same year. They were debated until the 17th of November, before they were adopted. A circular letter was then addressed to the States, recommending their assent. It must be remembered that New Hampshire, South Carolina, and Virginia, had formed State Constitutions before the month of July, 1776. New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Maryland, Delaware, and North Carolina, adopted Constitutions in the same year. New York formed a Constitution in April, 1777. So that a majority of the States existed under the form of popular governments when the plan for a federal compact was submitted to them by Congress in the month of November, 1777. We are perfectly willing to accord with the author in the view taken, at the close of the fourth chapter of his first book, of the imperfection of these articles, as they were then formed, and to agree with him as to the lesson taught the members of the confederacy, by their experience under that instrument. We note the form in which the State governments existed at the time of this federal alliance with particularity, only that we may show that the Constitution, formed afterwards, did not develop the fundamental idea which he suggests as the key of its reading—namely, that it became “the political union of the *people* of the United States, as distinguished from a union of the States of which they are citizens.”

It is not necessary that we should follow the author through the fifth chapter of his first book. It is written with remarkable succinctness, and we shall content ourselves with noticing such points only as bear incidentally upon the line of our observations. It is well known that the Articles of Confederation were adopted by eight States on the 9th of July,

1778, and by all of the remainder, except Delaware and Maryland, during that year. Delaware assented to the confederation on the 5th of May, 1779; but Maryland resisted all solicitations to unite with her sister States until March 1st, 1781, when she gave her assent also. We have referred to the causes which delayed the assent of the State of Maryland in our article upon the internal improvement power of the general government, in this number of the Review, and it is not necessary to recapitulate any of the views there suggested.

The Congress of 1778 was not remarkable for the men whom it contained. Laurens and Hayward, of South Carolina, Richard Henry Lee, of Virginia, Roger Sherman and Oliver Wolcott, of Connecticut, Robert Morris, of Pennsylvania, and Gouverneur Morris, of New York, were the only remarkable exceptions to the mediocrity of that body. The domestic politics of the States offered larger rewards and less onerous duties to the distinguished men who had occupied seats in the Congress of 1776. The Congress of 1778 was chiefly occupied in receiving the assent of the States to the Confederacy, and it achieved little for itself or for the country at large.

The first chapter of the second book of our author is devoted to the period of time between 1781 and 1783. The first Congress under the Articles of Confederation assembled in 1781. It was able to do little service to the common welfare. The States neglected to provide the means which they should have furnished under the terms of the confederation, and the good cause was in serious danger. In 1782, the discontent of the army reached a serious point, and the addresses of the officers of the army, known as "the Newburg addresses," added to the prevailing despondency. It is not material for us to review the history of those proceedings. The reader will find them fairly related by the author. But we feel at liberty to say that, if any circumstance tarnishes the conduct of our earliest Congress, then possessed of a full experience of what the soldiers of the Revolution had accom-

plished, it was the utter neglect to act with justice towards the revolutionary army. Washington had done all that man could do to awaken Congress to a sense of duty. A miserable spirit of economy disgraced the action of its members. Pennsylvania gave in vain a noble example of State liberality. The army was suffered to struggle on without hope until peace was declared. Its sufferings, its remonstrances were uncared for. In 1783, the discontents of the officers seemed about to break into open mutiny. They were allayed by the firm and conciliatory temper of Washington. Their claims were referred to Congress; they were compromised with, as if they had been mercantile creditors to an insolvent partnership, and were obliged to accept what was given them. The chapter of their wrongs is a blot upon our history, to which the American reader can never recur without shame.

The second chapter of the second book of our author relates to the public debt and financial history generally of the United States from 1781 to 1783. It is an admirable statement of the difficulties which involved the monetary affairs of the confederacy during that period, all resulting from one singular circumstance. The Articles of Confederation gave to Congress the power to contract debts, but practically, as it was found, afforded no means for providing for their payment. No government can long exist under such difficulties. Washington foresaw the danger; and Hamilton turned his active mind to such plans as seemed to him best adapted for its remedy. Hamilton had held the opinion that the provincial and continental Congress were possessed of larger powers than those which they had exercised, and had even argued that the general grant of power given to the federal Congress was sufficient for the desired end. But he was an advocate of a centralized government, and his known preferences biased his judgment. He practically conceded his error by the earnest appeals he made for such amendments of the Articles of Confederation, as would make the government an effective political machine. While few or none, at



this day, will concur with him in thinking that the general government should possess the unrestricted powers, which he was willing to see confided to its keeping, we acknowledge that his views of the defects of the confederation, given in a letter to James Duane, in 1780, are full of practical wisdom. Indeed they were largely adopted when the present Constitution of the United States was framed. While we believe that the development of all of his theories would have resulted in a mischief to the country, as fatal as could have befallen it under the Articles of Confederation, we yet cheerfully acknowledge the service which he rendered in bringing into existence the instrument under which we live. This desire to centralize the power of the government was so strong and active, and was urged with such power, that he mainly caused, without his own assent and against his judgment, that compromise between national and state sovereignty, which is the firm foundation of our prosperity under the present Constitution.

There was great occasion for his labor in the Congress of 1783. The State governments absorbed all interests; Congress at the close of that year had dwindled to a junta of twenty persons. These even had no fixed place for assembling. Eighty discontented soldiers surrounded the State House, in Philadelphia, where they were assembled on the 21st of June, and pointed their muskets at the windows. The State authorities could not protect the sittings. On the 24th of June Congress was obliged to adjourn to Princeton, under the intimidation of this motley band. The small remnant of their numbers met in the college halls of Princeton on the 30th of June, in order to debate in peace and safety. This single circumstance aptly illustrates the condition of the federal government at that time.

Nor did matters mend in 1784. In the Congress of that year, which met at Annapolis in the State of Maryland, only seven States were represented, and only fifteen members were in attendance. The resignation of Washington was received in the presence of twenty delegates. Congress was obliged

to solicit the States to enforce the attendance of their delegates, and although Congress had met on the 3d of November, 1783, it was not until the 14th of January, 1784, that the treaty of peace with Great Britain could be ratified by the constitutional number of nine States. When this did take place, there were present but twenty-three members of Congress. Indeed from the ratification of this treaty of peace in 1784, until the adoption of the new Constitution, the Congress of the confederation, "though entitled to ninety-one members, was seldom attended by one third of that number; and the state of the representation was sometimes so low, that one-eighth of the whole number present could, under the constitutional rule, negative the most important measures." Well might Washington and Hamilton have sought to amend such a system.

From the year 1781 to the year 1786 the federal government had, under the terms of the Articles of Confederation, made requisitions upon the States for the sum of ten millions of dollars. It had received less than two millions and a half. In the last two months of the year 1784 and in the year 1785, the receipts had not been such as would have made an average of four hundred thousand dollars per annum. The interest on the foreign debt was more than half a million, and one million per year of this foreign debt was falling due, and would so fall due for nine years. The domestic debt and the expenses of the army, navy and civil list were wholly unprovided for. The confederation was unequivocally bankrupt. The laws and practice of the States were, by the provisions of the treaty of peace, brought into collision with the duties of the general government. All that Congress could do was to resolve and recommend, and resolutions and recommendations on all pecuniary points were in vain. It was apparent at last in 1786, when Shay's rebellion broke out in Massachusetts, that the federal government was not even capable of affording useful assistance to a State government, when its very existence was threatened by intestine war. It then became apparent, to use the words of Washington, that there was need for "a liberal and energetic Constitution, well

checked and well watched to prevent encroachments." This was the true aim and wise end of the proposed constitutional reform.

We have been brought in our review to the fourth chapter of the third book of the author. It requires no comment. It is a narration only of the relation of the Federal Government to the commerce of the States. The fifth chapter of the same book contains a history of the public lands of the United States, and of the government of the North Western Territory from 1783 to 1787. There are questions partially settled and still pending, which make this branch of the subject peculiarly interesting; and we shall therefore comment more largely upon this chapter.

The larger States, by their delegates in Congress, refused to agree that the Articles of Confederation should contain a provision, giving to Congress the exclusive right and power to fix the western boundaries of those States, which claimed to the Mississippi, or South sea, and to lay out the land, beyond the boundaries thus determined, into separate States from time to time as circumstances might require. Their idea of a federal compact did not embrace any abandonment of their larger rights of soil for the good of the whole confederacy, or for the better assurance of the fears of the smaller States. But ultimately, when New York set the example of a generous abandonment of her claims, Congress, by resolution, on October 10th, 1780, made such declarations as indicated decisively that the new territory was to be held only in tutelage, as it were, until it had acquired population sufficient for its erection into States, sovereign and independent as the other parties to the federal compact. Virginia imitated the liberal policy of New York. Congress then once more, on the 23d of April, 1784, by resolution, provided for the government of this extended territory. This new regulation also looked directly to the division of the newly acquired land into sovereign States, reserving to the General Government only those mere proprietary rights which might remain unextinguished by public grant, or private purchase. The character of this

action, on the part of Congress, shows very conclusively that the public lands were only looked to as the means of extending the political organization of the confederacy. Soon after, Massachusetts and Connecticut ceded their rights to the western territory, and South Carolina followed their example. Of the territory thus acquired, the great bulk was contained in the cession of Virginia. It lay north-west of the Ohio river. The resolves of 1780 and 1784, did not provide sufficiently for its speedy government, and a large population was rapidly pouring into it. The ordinance of July 13th, 1787, was framed to meet the contingency. To its general provisions no exception can be taken. It was wisely adapted to the end which it was designed to secure. Its sixth section, prohibiting slavery or involuntary servitude in the territory, except for the punishment of crimes has been, however, the fruitful source of serious mischief to the peace of the country from that period down to the present time.

The author has wisely forbore to make any comment upon this section. We accord him praise for his forbearance; but, as it is certain that the ordinance of 1787 did, without warrant, provide for the admission of new parties to the federal compact, without the assent of the original parties to the confederacy, as was clearly needful; so, also, it transcended the line of justice to the inhabitants of the slave States, by prohibiting the transportation of their property into the ceded territory. Especially was this unjust towards the State of Virginia, which had, before its cession, such right of eminent domain as would have kept this territory always open to the influx of any species of labor, or capital, which her citizens might have held. But little or no remonstrance seems at that day to have attended the ingrafting of this section upon the ordinance. The power to foresee the future was denied to the Southern statesmen who sat in the Congress of 1787. The ordinance was adopted with the section included. It was the singular ill-fortune of the State of Virginia to open the avenue to aggression upon her own rights, and upon those of her sister Southern States, by not



making abstinence from legislation on the subject of slavery one of those conditions which accompanied the offer of cession in 1781, to the Confederation of the States in Congress assembled. For, although the ordinance of 1787 was without authority, yet it was acted upon, and the civil polity of the States in process of formation within the limits of the Northwest territory, was as firmly established by its existence as if the subject had been within the undoubted scope of federal authority.

We shall do no more than call attention to the author's account of the circumstances under which the navigation of the Mississippi began to attract public attention. The reader will find a very satisfactory account of our relations, under the confederation, to the two Floridas and to Louisiana, in the latter part of chapter fifth, book third.

In the sixth chapter of book third, the author summarily refers to the defects in the federal compact, to which we have already made allusion. In deriving a reason from these, he observes "that the great difficulty of the case, which made it so complex and embarrassing, arose from the separated sovereign and independent existence of the States. The formation of new constitutions in countries not thus divided, involves only the adaptation of new institutions and forms to the genius, the laws, and the habits of the people. The monarchy of France has in our day been first remodeled, and afterwards swept from the face of Europe, to be followed by a republican constitution, which has in its turn been crushed and superseded. But France is a country which has been long subjected to as complete and powerful a system of centralization as has existed any where since the most energetic period of the Roman empire; and whether its institutions have or have not needed to be changed, as they have been from time to time, those changes have been made in a country in which an entire political unity has greatly facilitated the operation."

We would earnestly ask the author whether the experience of France has been such as to warrant any admiration of its

centralized government. It is true that the States General, which were convened in France at Necker's solicitation in 1789, were practically succeeded by the "Third Estate," when they declared themselves the representatives of the nation, soon after the meeting of the whole body. It is true that on the 22d of June following the order of legislation was again altered by the acclamation of Louis the sixteenth, that he would hold a royal session. It is true that the States General were merged into an assembly in the same year, which was known as the constituent assembly. It is true that this was succeeded by a Constitution, and by a legislative assembly. It is true that this assembly declared itself shortly afterwards "in a state of insurrection," and deposed the king. It is true that France was declared a republic, and passed through the disastrous days of its internal disorder to the consulate of Napoleon and to the imperial era, and from thence declined again to royalty. It is true that there was an elected king, who became in his turn nearly absolute and again a republic, and again an empire. It is true that all this and more occurred in sixty years. But, to our mind, the centralization of power, which effected these results is a matter for warning, and not for imitation. A centralized government is a pyramid resting upon its apex. If the balance is once lost, it is wholly overthrown.

The author has, in the succeeding paragraph, to that which we have last referred, expressed an opinion, which to our mind better expresses the true relation in which the government should have stood to the States, and which might, with some slight modification be adopted as the standard for the interpretation of the charter, which took the place of the Articles of Confederation.

"In the United States, on the contrary, a federal government was to be created; and it was to be created for thirteen distinct communities;—a government that should not destroy the political sovereignties of the States, and should yet introduce a new sovereignty, formed by means of powers, whose surrender by the States, instead of weakening their present strength, would rather develop and increase it. This

peculiar difficulty may be constantly traced, amidst all the embarrassments of the period in which the fundamental idea of the Constitution was at length evolved."

Whatever may have been the opinion of public men in 1785, as to the powers which the Federal Government ought to have possessed, it seems to have been agreed on all hands that the Articles of Confederation suggested endless causes of difference between the States and the Government. The advocates of States' rights, who opposed any step looking to their amendment, took this course, more it would seem from apprehension of the extent to which a reform would go, than from any good opinion of the efficiency of the agreement under which the States adhered. But as the character of the Federal Congress annually declined, and the attendance upon its sessions became less numerous, the necessity for some decided step became evident. Governor Bowdoin, of Massachusetts, made the first efficient movement by recommending the appointment of special delegates from all the States, who should determine upon such additional powers as it was proper to confer upon the government. The legislature of Massachusetts acted upon this message, and resolutions to the same effect were adopted. But they were never presented. The Massachusetts delegation in Congress were opposed to the step, and Congress attributed the movement to designing men, who were anxious to loosen the foundations of the federal system. The Massachusetts delegates expressed the fear that the aristocratic element, which was then supposed to exist in the confederacy, would control the form and spirit of the new federal agreement.

Virginia in 1784, was happily led in the same direction by the necessity, which then existed, of providing some settlement of the conflict, which subsisted between the Legislature of Maryland and her own as to the regulation of trade upon the Potomac and other rivers, and on the Chesapeake bay. It was at once apparent that this subject could not well be specially legislated for. The Legislatures therefore passed, on Jan. 21st, 1786, the resolution providing that delegates from

Virginia should meet delegates from the other States, and that they should consider and report such an act as would, when adopted by the States, enable Congress to provide for a uniform system in the commercial regulations of the States. New York followed in the same path. This convention met at Annapolis. But five States were represented. Hamilton, however, who was a delegate, resolved that some action should be taken; and he presented a report to his colleagues, which formally proposed to the several States the assembling of a general convention to take into consideration the situation of the United States. The language of the report was eminently cautious, since the proceeding was in apparent, if not in real derogation of the Articles of Confederation. The report was adopted.

Congress, however, hesitated; but early in 1787, Hamilton carried a resolution in the Legislature of New York, instructing the delegates of that State in Congress, to move for an act recommending the States to send delegates to a convention for the purpose of revising the Articles of Confederation. This was presented in Congress within four days afterwards. It was not adopted; but one identical in spirit was presented by the delegates from Massachusetts, and was carried.

The sixth chapter of the third book of the author, in which these transactions are more fully stated, is very instructive. We can only recommend it to the reader. It gives a very good view of the fears and hopes of those distinguished men, who had achieved the independence of the country, and were now about to make a last experiment to secure that blessing to posterity.

With the chapter last referred to, the regular narrative of the first volume of the author is concluded. He has arrived at that period in which the construction of the present Constitution began. We purpose, when the second volume of his work appears, to review it more elaborately than we have considered the first volume. We can foresee its importance in the formation of opinion. We shall enter upon the duty hereafter with the same spirit of candor which has, we hope,



characterized our course thus far. In conclusion, we shall extract, for the benefit of the reader, some portions of the sketches of the lives of the framers of the Constitution, which are interposed between the first and second volumes, and which are at once graceful and instructive.

Of Washington, the author writes as follows:—

“I have already given an account of the proceedings which led directly to the calling of the Convention; and have mentioned the interesting fact, that the impulse to those proceedings was given at Mount Vernon. Thither General Washington had retired, at the close of the war, with no thought of ever engaging again in public affairs. He supposed that for him the scene was closed. ‘The noontide of life,’ said he, in a letter to the Marchioness de Lafayette, ‘is now past, with Mrs. Washington and myself; and all we have to do is to glide gently down a stream which no human effort can ascend.’

“But, wise and far-seeing as he was, he did not foresee how soon he was to be called from that grave and sweet tranquillity. He was busy with the concerns of his farm; he was tasting the happiness of home, from which he had been absent nine long years; he was ‘cultivating the affections of good men, and practicing the domestic virtues.’ But it was not in his nature to be inattentive to the concerns of that country for whose welfare he had labored and suffered so much. He maintained an active correspondence with several of the most eminent and virtuous of his compatriots in different parts of the Union; and in that correspondence, running through the years 1784, 1785, and 1786, there exists the most ample evidence of the downward tendency of things, and of the fears it excited.”

Again—

“But Washington at Mount Vernon, cultivating his estate, and rarely leaving his own farms, was as conspicuous to the country as if he were still placed in the most active and important public stations. All eyes were turned to him in this emergency; all thoughts were employed in considering whether his countenance and his influence would be given to this attempt to create a national government for the States whose liberties he had won. And his friends represented to him, that the posture of public affairs would prevent any criticism on the situation in which the contemporary meeting

of the Cincinnati would place him, if he were to accept a seat in the Convention. Still, when the official notice of his appointment came, in December, he formally declined, but was requested by the Governor of the State to reserve his decision. At this moment, the insurrection in Massachusetts broke upon him like a thunderbolt. 'What, gracious God!' he exclaimed, 'is man, that there should be such inconsistency and perfidiousness in his conduct! It was but the other day that we were shedding our blood to obtain the constitutions under which we now live,—constitutions of our own choice and making,—and now we are unsheathing the sword to overturn them! The thing is so unaccountable, that I hardly know how to realize it, or to persuade myself that I am not under the illusion of a dream.'

The character of Washington is thus sketched:—

"The character of Washington as a statesman has, perhaps, been somewhat undervalued, from two causes; one of them being his military greatness, and the other, the extraordinary balance of his mind, which presented no brilliant and few salient qualities. Undoubtedly, as a statesman he was not constructive, like Hamilton, nor did he possess the same abundant and ever-ready resources. He was eminently cautious, but he was also eminently sagacious. He had had a wide field of observation during the war, the theatre of which, commencing in New England, had extended through the Middle and into the Southern States. He had, of course, been brought in contact with the men and the institutions of all the States, and had been concerned in their conflicts with the federal authority, to a greater extent than any other public man of the time. This experience had not prepared him—as the character of his mind had not prepared him—to suggest plans or frame institutions fitted to remedy the evils he had observed, and to apply the principles which he had discovered. But it had revealed to him the dangers and difficulties of our situation, and had made him a national statesman, as incapable of confining his politics to the narrow scale of local interests and attachments, as he had been of confining his exertions to the object of achieving the liberties of a single State.

"He would have been fitly placed in the chair of any deliberative assembly into which he might have been called at any period of his life; but it was pre-eminently suitable that he should occupy that of the Convention for forming the

Constitution. He had no talent for debate, and upon the floor of this body he would have exerted less influence, and have been far less the central object towards which the opinions and views of the members were directed, than he was in the high and becoming position to which he was now called."

We make several extracts from the sketch of Hamilton, because it is deserving of much notice.

"This eminent person is probably less well known to the nation at the present day, than most of the leading statesmen of the Revolution. There are causes for this in his history. He never attained to that high office which has conferred celebrity on inferior men. The political party of which he was one of the founders and one of the chief leaders, became unpopular with the great body of his countrymen before it was extinct. His death, too, at the early age of forty-seven, while it did not leave an unfinished character, left an unfinished career for the contemplation of posterity. In this respect, his fate was unlike that of nearly all his most distinguished contemporaries. Washington, Adams, Jefferson, Madison, Jay, and in fact almost all the prominent statesmen of the Revolution, died in old age or in advanced life, and after the circle of their public honors and usefulness had been completed. Hamilton was cut off at a period of life when he may be said to have had above a third of its best activity yet before him: and this is doubtless one cause why so little is popularly known by the present generation of him who was by far the greatest statesman of the Revolutionary age.

"It is known, indeed, traditionally, what a thrill of horror—what a sharp, terrible pang—ran through the nation, proving the comprehension by the entire people of what was lost, when Aaron Burr took from his country and the world that important life. In the most distant extremities of the Union, men felt that one of the first intellects of the age had been extinguished. From the utmost activity and public consideration, in the fullness of his strength and usefulness, the bullet of a duelist had taken the first statesman in America;—a man who, while he had not been without errors, and while his life had not been without mistakes, had served his country, from his boyhood to that hour of her bitter bereavement, with an elevation of purpose and a force of intellect never exceeded in her history, and which had caused Washington to lean upon him and to trust him, as he trusted and leaned upon

no other man, from first to last. The death of such a man, under such circumstances, cast a deep gloom over the face of society; and Hamilton was mourned by his contemporaries with a sorrow founded on a just appreciation of his greatness, and of what they owed to his intellect and character. But by the generations that have succeeded he has been less intimately known than many of his compatriots, who lived longer, and reached stations which he never occupied.

"His great characteristic was his profound insight into the principles of government. The sagacity with which he comprehended all systems, and the thorough knowledge he possessed of the working of all the freer institutions of ancient and modern times, united with a singular capacity to make the experience of the past bear on the actual state of society, rendered him one of the most useful statesmen that America has known. Whatever in the science of government had already been ascertained; whatever the civil condition of mankind in any age had made practicable or proved abortive; whatever experience had demonstrated; whatever the passions, the interests, or the wants of men had made inevitable,—he seemed to know intuitively. But he was no theorist. His powers were all eminently practical. He detected the vice of a theory instantly, and shattered it with a single blow.

"His knowledge, too, of the existing state of his own and of other countries was not less remarkable than his knowledge of the past. He understood America as thoroughly as the wisest of his contemporaries, and he comprehended Europe more completely than any other man of that age upon this continent.

"To these characteristics he added a clear logical power in statement, a vigorous reasoning, a perfect frankness and moral courage, and a lofty disdain of all the arts of a demagogue. His eloquence was distinguished for correctness of language and distinctness of utterance, as well as for grace and dignity.

"In theory, he leaned decidedly to the Constitution of England, as the best form of civil polity for the attainment of the great objects of government. But he was not, on that account, less a lover of liberty than those who favored more popular and democratic institutions. His writings will be searched in vain for any disregard of the natural rights of mankind, or any insensibility to the blessings of freedom. It was because he believed that those blessings can be best secured by governments in which a change of rulers is not of frequent



occurrence, that he had so high an estimate of the English Constitution. At the period of the Convention, he held that the chief want of this country was a government into which the element of a permanent tenure of office could be largely infused; and he read in the convention—as an illustration of his views, but without pressing it—a plan by which the Executive and the Senate could hold their office during good behaviour. But the idea, which has sometimes been promulgated, that he desired the establishment of a monarchical government in this country, is without foundation. At no period of his life did he regard that experiment as either practicable or desirable.

“Hamilton’s relation to the Constitution is peculiar. He had less direct agency in framing its chief provisions than many of the other principal persons who sat in the convention; and some of its provisions were not wholly acceptable to him when framed. But the history which has been detailed in the previous chapters of this work, of the progress of federal ideas, and of the efforts to introduce and establish principles tending to consolidate the Union, has been largely occupied with the recital of his opinions, exertions, and prevalent influence. Beginning with the year 1780, when he was only three-and-twenty years of age, and when he sketched the outline of a national government strongly resembling the one which the Constitution long afterwards established; passing through the term of his service in Congress, when his admirable expositions of the revenue system, the commercial power, and the ratio of contribution, may justly be said to have saved the Union from dissolution; and coming down to the time when he did so much to bring about, first, the meeting at Annapolis, and then the general and final Convention of all the States;—the whole period is marked by his wisdom and filled with his power. He did more than any other public man of the time to lessen the force of State attachments, to create a national feeling, and to lead the public mind to a comprehension of the necessity for an efficient national sovereignty.

“Indeed, he was the first to perceive and to develop the idea of a real union of the people of the United States. To him, more than to any one else, is to be attributed the conviction that the people of the different States were competent to establish a general government by their own direct action; and that this mode of proceeding ought to be considered within the contemplation of the State legislatures, when they

appointed delegates to a convention for the revision and amendment of the existing system.

"The age in which he lived, and the very extraordinary early maturity of his character, naturally remind us of that remarkable person who was two years his junior, and who became prime-minister of England at the age of twenty-four. The younger Pitt entered public life with almost every possible advantage. Inheriting 'a great and celebrated name,' educated expressly for the career of a statesman, and introduced into the House of Commons at a moment when power was just ready to drop into the hands of any man capable of wielding it, he had only to prove himself a brilliant and powerful debater, in order to become the ruler of an empire, whose constitution had been settled for ages, and was necessarily administered by the successful leaders of regular parties in its legislative body. That he was a most eminent parliamentary orator, a consummate tactician and leader of party, a minister of singular energy, and a statesman of a very high order of mind and character, at an age when most men are scarcely beginning to give proofs of what they may become,—all this history has deliberately and finally recorded. What place it may assign to him among the statesmen by whose lives and actions England and the world have been materially and permanently benefited, is not yet settled, and it is not to the present purpose to consider."

Of James Madison, the author says:—

"In the convention, his labors must have been far more arduous than those of any other member of the body. He took a leading part in the debates, speaking upon every important question; and in addition to all the usual duties devolving upon a person of so much ability and influence, he preserved a full and careful record of the discussions with his own hand. Impressed, as he says, with the magnitude of the trust confided to the convention, and foreseeing the interest that must attach to an authentic exhibition of the objects, the opinions, and the reasonings from which the new system of government was to receive its peculiar structure and organization, he devoted the hours of the night succeeding the session of each day to the preparation of the record with which his name is imperishably associated. 'Nor was I,' he adds, 'unaware of the value of such a contribution to the fund of materials for the history of a Constitution on which would be staked the happiness of a people, great even in its infancy, and possibly the cause of liberty throughout the world.'"

## Of Benjamin Franklin:—

“It is chiefly, however, by the countenance he gave to the effort to frame a Constitution, that his services as a member of this body are to be estimated. His mind was at all times ingenious, rather than large and constructive; and his great age, while it had scarcely at all impaired his natural powers, had confirmed him in some opinions which must certainly be regarded as mistaken. His desire, for example, to have the legislature of the United States consist of a single body, for the sake of simplicity, and his idea that the chief executive magistrate ought to receive no salary for his official services, for the sake of purity, were both singular and unsound.

“But there were points upon which he displayed extraordinary wisdom, penetration, and forecast. When an objection to a proportionate representation in Congress was started, upon the ground that it would enable the larger States to swallow up the smaller, he declared that, as the great States could propose to themselves no advantage by absorbing their inferior neighbors, he did not believe they would attempt it. His recollection carried him back to the early part of the century, when the union between England and Scotland was proposed, and when the Scotch patriots were alarmed by the idea that they should be ruined by the superiority of England, unless they had an equal number of members in Parliament; and yet, notwithstanding the great inferiority in their representation as established by the act of union, he declared that, down to that day, he did not recollect that any thing had been done in the Parliament of Great Britain to the prejudice of Scotland.

“Although he spoke but seldom in the Convention, his influence was very great, and it was always exerted to cool the ardor of debate, and to check the tendency of such discussions to result in irreconcilable differences. His great age, his venerable and benignant aspect, his wide reputation, his acute and sagacious philosophy,—which was always the embodiment of good sense,—would have given him a controlling weight in a much more turbulent and a far less intelligent assembly. When—after debates in which the powerful intellects around him had exhausted the subject, and both sides remained firm in opinions diametrically opposed—he rose and reminded them that they were sent to consult and not to contend, and that declarations of a fixed opinion and a determination never to change it neither enlightened nor convinced those who listened to them, his authority was felt by men

who could have annihilated any mere logical argument that might have proceeded from him in his best days.

"Dr. Franklin was one of those who entertained serious objections to the Constitution, but he sacrificed them before the Convention was dissolved. Believing a general government to be necessary for the American States; holding that every form of government might be made a blessing to the people by a good administration; and foreseeing that the Constitution would be well administered for a long course of years, and could only end in despotism when the people should have become so corrupted as to be incapable of any other than a despotic government, he gladly embraced a system which he was astonished to find approaching so near to perfection.

" 'The opinions I have had of its errors,' said he, 'I sacrifice to the public good. Within these walls they were born, and here they shall die. If every one of us, in returning to our constituents, were to report the objections he has had to it, and endeavor to gain partisans in support of them, we might prevent its being generally received, and thereby lose all the salutary effects and great advantages resulting naturally in our favor, among foreign nations as well as among ourselves, from our real or apparent unanimity. Much of the strength and efficiency of any government in procuring and securing happiness to the people depends on opinion,—on the general opinion of the goodness of the government, as well as of the wisdom and integrity of its governors. I hope, therefore, that for our own sakes as a part of the people, and for the sake of posterity, we shall act heartily and unanimously in recommending this Constitution (approved by Congress and confirmed by the conventions) wherever our influence may extend, and turn our future thoughts and endeavors to the means of having it well administered.'

"And thus, with a cheerful confidence in the future, sustaining the hopes of all about him, and hailing every omen that foretold the rising glories of his country, this wise old man passed out from the assembly, when its anxious labors had been brought to a close with a nearer approach to unanimity than had ever been expected. He lived, borne down by infirmities,

'To draw his breath in pain'

for nearly three years after the Convention was dissolved; but it was to see the Constitution established, to witness the growing strength of the new government, and to contemplate



the opening successes and beneficent promises of Washington's administration. Writing to the first President in 1789, he said: 'For my own personal ease, I should have died two years ago; but though those years have been spent in excruciating pain, I am pleased that I have lived them, since they have brought me to see our present situation.'

Of Gouverneur Morris:—

"In his political opinions, he probably went farther in opposition to democratic tendencies than any other person in the Convention. He was in favor of an executive during good behaviour, of a Senate for life, and of a freehold qualification for electors of representatives. In several other respects the Constitution, as actually framed, was distasteful to him; but, like many of the other eminent men who doubted its theoretical or practical wisdom, he determined at once to abide by the voice of the majority. He saw that, as soon as the plan should go forth, all other considerations ought to be laid aside, and the great question ought to be, Shall there be a national government or not? He acknowledged that the alternatives were, the adoption of the system proposed, or a general anarchy;—and before this single and fearful issue all questions of individual opinion or preference sank into insignificance. It is a proof both of his sincerity and of the estimate in which his abilities were held, that, when this great issue was presented to the people, he was invited by Hamilton to become one of the writers of the *Federalist*. It is not known why he did not embrace the opportunity of connecting himself with that celebrated publication; but his correspondence shows that it was from no want of interest in the result. He took pains to give to Washington his decided testimony, from personal observation, that the idea of his refusing the Presidency would, if it prevailed, be fatal to the Constitution in many parts of the country."

Of Rufus King:—

"The Convention having been sanctioned by Congress, no man was more ready than Mr. King to maintain its power to deliberate on and propose any alterations that Congress could have suggested in the Federal Articles. He held that the proposing of an entire change in the mode of suffrage in the national legislature, from a representation of the States alone to a representation of the people, was within the scope of their powers, and consistent with the Union; for if that

Union, on the one hand, involved the idea of a confederation, on the other hand it contained also the idea of consolidation, from which a national character resulted to the individuals of whom the States were composed. He doubted the practicability of annihilating the State governments, but thought that much of their power ought to be taken from them. He declared that, when every *man* in America might be secured in his rights, by a government founded on equality of representation, he could not sacrifice such a substantial good to the phantom of *State* sovereignty. If this illusion were to continue to prevail, he should be prepared for any event, rather than sit down under a government founded on a vicious principle of representation, and one that must be as short-lived as it would be unjust.

“There is one feature of the Constitution with which the name of Mr. King should always be connected, and of which he may be said, indeed, to have been the author. Towards the close of the session, he introduced the prohibition on the States to pass laws affecting the obligation of contracts. It appears that the ordinance for the government of the Northwestern Territory, which had been passed by Congress about a month previous, contained a similar prohibition on the States to be formed out of that territory. That any of the jurists who were concerned in the framing of either instrument foresaw at the moment all the great future importance and extensive operation of this wise and effective provision, we are not authorized to affirm. But a clause which has enabled the supreme national judicature to exercise a vast, direct, and uniform influence on the security of property throughout all the States of this Confederacy, should be permanently connected with the names of its authors.”

Of Charles Cotesworth Pinckney :—

“He was, indeed, one of that order of men to whom Washington gave his entire confidence from the first. A ripe scholar, a profound lawyer, with Revolutionary laurels of the most honorable kind,—wise, energetic, and disinterested,—it is not singular that the people of South Carolina should have selected him as one of their delegates to an assembly which was to frame a new constitution of government for the country to whose service his earlier years had been devoted.

“General Pinckney entered the Convention with a desire to adhere, if possible, to the characteristic principles of the Confederation ; but also with a wish to make that government

more effective, by giving to it distinct departments and enlarged powers. But in the progress of the discussions, he surrendered these views, and became a party to those arrangements by which mutual concessions between the opposing sections of the Union made a different form of government a practicable result."

Again—

"It is no inconsiderable honor to the statesmen situated as General Pinckney and other representatives of the Southern States were, that they should have frankly yielded the prejudices, and what they supposed to be the interests, of their constituents, to the great object of forming a more perfect union. Certainly they could urge, with equal if not greater force and truth, the same arguments for the continuance of the slave-trade, which for nearly twenty years afterwards were continually heard in the British Parliament, and which postponed its abolition until long after the people of England had become satisfied both of its inhumanity and its impolicy. Whether General Pinckney was right or wrong in the opinion that his constituents needed no national regulation of commerce, there can be no doubt of his sincerity when he expressed it. Nor can there be any doubt that he was fully convinced of the fact, when he asserted that they would not adopt a constitution that should vest in the national government an immediate power to prohibit the importation of slaves. He made, therefore, a real concession, when he consented to the prohibition at the end of twenty years, and he made it in order that the union of the thirteen States might be preserved under a Constitution adequate to its wants.

"For this, as well as for other services, he is entitled to a place of honor among the great men who framed the charter of our national liberties; and when we recollect that by his action he armed the national government with a power to free the American name from the disgrace of tolerating the slave-trade, before it was effectually put down by any other people in Christendom, we need not hesitate to rank him high among those who made great sacrifices for the general welfare of the country and the general good of mankind."

Of Edmund Randolph:—

"Edmund Randolph, 'a child of the Revolution,' was Governor of Virginia at the time of the Federal Convention. Probably it was on account of his position as the chief magis-

trate of the State that he was, by the general consent of his colleagues, selected to bring forward the Virginia plan of government, which was submitted at an early period of the deliberations, and which became, after great modifications, the nucleus of the Constitution.

“Governor Randolph’s conduct with regard to the Constitution might seem to be marked by inconsistency, if we were not able to explain it by the motive of disinterested patriotism from which he evidently acted. He brought to the Convention the most serious apprehensions for the fate of the Union. But he thought that the dangers with which it was surrounded might be averted, by correcting and enlarging the Articles of Confederation. When, at length, the government which was actually framed was found to be a system containing far greater restraints upon the powers of the States than he believed to be either expedient or safe, he endeavored to procure a vote authorizing amendments to be submitted by the State conventions and to be finally decided on by another general convention. This proposition having been rejected, he declined to sign the Constitution, desiring to be free to oppose or advocate its adoption, when it should come before his own State, as his judgment might dictate.

“When the time for such action came, he saw that the rejection of the Constitution must be followed by disunion. He had wearied himself in endeavoring to find a possibility of preserving the Union without an unconditional ratification by Virginia. To the people of Virginia, therefore, he painted with great force and eloquence the consequences of their becoming severed from the rest of the country.

“In this state of things, looking forward to the consequences of a dissolution of the Union, he could not but remind the people of Virginia of what took place in 1781, when the power of a dictator was given to the commander-in-chief, to save the country from destruction. At some period, not very remote, might not their future distress impel them to do what the Dutch had done,—throw all power into the hands of a Stadtholder? How infinitely more wise and eligible than this desperate alternative would be a union with their American brethren. ‘I have labored,’ said he, ‘for the continuance of the Union,—the rock of our salvation. I believe, as surely as that there is a God, that our safety, our political happiness and existence depend on the Union of the States, and that, without this union, the people of this and the other States will undergo the unspeakable calamities which discord, fac-



tion, turbulence, war, and bloodshed have produced in other countries. The American spirit ought to be mixed with American pride, to see the union magnificently triumphant.' ”

There are portions of these sketches which are open to criticism. But as the estimate of the relative standing of public men is a question, which debates cannot determine, we shall not weigh the conclusions of the author on such subjects. A candid reader will not expect every author to accord with his judgment.

---

ART. VI.—1. FAMILIAR LETTERS ON CHEMISTRY, *in its relations to Physiology, Dietetics, &c.* By JUSTUS VON LIEBIG. London, 1851.

2. THE CHEMISTRY OF COMMON LIFE. By JAMES F. W. JOHNSTON, M.A., F.R.S., F.G.S., &c. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1854.

3. POETRY OF THE VEGETABLE WORLD; *a popular Exposition of the Science of Botany, and its relations to Man.* By M. J. SCHLEIDEN, M.D., Professor of Botany in the University of Jena. Edited by Alphonso Wood, M.A., author of “The Class-Book of Botany.” Cincinnati: Moore, Anderson, Wilstock & Keys. 1853.

4. CHEMISTRY OF THE FOUR SEASONS, SPRING, SUMMER, AUTUMN, AND WINTER; *an Essay, principally concerning Natural Phenomena admitting of interpretation by Chemical Science, and illustrating Passages of Scripture.* By THOMAS GRIFFITHS, Professor of Chemistry in the Medical College of St. Bartholomew’s Hospital, &c.

THERE is a growing disposition, on the part of the people at large, to recognize the importance of science. Hence the numerous works on various scientific subjects, treated in a popular manner, which are so frequently written, so widely circulated, and so extensively read. The “reading public,” that universal devourer of books, claims this sort of nutri-

ment, and gets it, of course,—for no autocrat is more imperious, or more implicitly obeyed.

Among the many articles gotten up to satisfy this demand, there are, of course, some exceedingly weak and superficial, disfigured by blunders in style and by errors in fact. There are, however, numbers which belong by no means to this class, which are beautiful in their conception, elegant in their execution, and useful in their design;—books which not only serve to instruct the novice and to attract the general reader, but also to refresh the memory of the adept, and to set before the accomplished scholar old and well-known facts in a new and attractive light.

Of the works at the head of this article we may say a few words in general, before proceeding to the study of the particular subject we design presenting to our readers. The “Familiar Letters” of the eminent Professor at Giessen have been for years before the public, and have received the just encomiums of all discriminating readers. Clear and forcible in style, copious in illustration, profoundly learned and yet extremely simple, they afford a perfect model of a popular work on science. They have been recently revised by their distinguished author; numerous additions have been made to them, so that they are now brought down to the present time, and present to the public a readable and reliable account of the interesting subjects to which they refer.

Professor Johnston is well known by his admirable Lectures on Agricultural Chemistry, which have gone through repeated editions, and have become a text-book of this useful science. His present work is a series of short but satisfactory essays, simplifying to common comprehension the various abstruse subjects of which he treats.

The third work on our list is Schleiden’s exquisite *morceau*, “The Plant; a Biography,” which the Cincinnati editor has most absurdly, prosaically, and inexcusably transformed into the dull title we have recorded. Mr. Wood has made himself favorably known by a very clever attempt to arrange the plants of the Northern States in such a manner as to make

the natural system do field-duty, and serve pupils as a sort of lexicon of botany,—a task heretofore thrown upon the Linnæan system exclusively. We cannot say much, however, for the manner in which he has conducted his present task. His preface is a very dreary piece of twaddle, and his omissions—though very well, perhaps, for the Cincinnati market—have certainly not improved the book for the majority of readers. His notes are generally harmless, being mostly formal tilts at geology and German theology, with neither of which we have, at present, any concern. Schleiden's own book, untainted by his editor's subtractions or additions, is the most charming volume of which we know any thing since St. Pierre's famous *Studies of Nature*, and it has a merit which that fascinating book does not always possess—rigorous scientific truth. It has, indeed, as might be expected, some Teutonic mysticism about it, and its learned author leans manifestly towards a sort of botanical translation of Muillet's absurd old development theory. These little eccentricities aside, his book is wellnigh perfect.

The "Chemistry of the Four Seasons" has also for a long time delighted and instructed the world. It has not the high poetical merit of Schleiden's book, (as whose work has?) but it is a lucid, familiar exposition of the chemical principles on which the changes of the seasons depend.

These books all discuss very much the same set of themes,—the relations of inorganic and organic nature, and the chemical changes upon which the various revolutions of dead and living matter depend. Liebig, indeed, discusses other matters,—such as the economic uses of the science; yet he gives prominence to the theories and speculations of organic chemistry.

One of the most important lessons we learn from this sort of general survey is, the intimate connection and mutual inter-dependence of the sciences. It is the analogue of what we see in Nature. The student has but half coned his lesson, if he has failed to learn that nothing is isolated—that nothing exists for itself alone. God has economized existence, and

laid more than one duty on every thing he has created. The great forest tree has somewhat else to do than merely to live and grow. Birds shelter in its branches, and rear their young beneath the shadow of its leaves; beasts feed on the mast that is showered from its lofty boughs; its dropping leaves return to the soil a portion of the nutriment it has borrowed; its fallen trunk is cut up for human habitations; its very decay is prolific in new life—new forms spring from its ashes; brighter but frailer creatures are the offspring of its ruin. The solemn mountain, that rears its hoary brow high in the clear, bright air, subserves a thousand useful purposes to countless tribes of men and animals. The slow attrition of its rocky sides forms soil which perpetually renews the fertility of the adjoining valleys. Its multitudinous green boughs give harbor and food to a thousand living things—"many light hearts and wings lodge in the living towers" of its investing forest. Its deep seams and stony hollows, sheltered from the heat of the blazing sun by overhanging leaves, hold in their cold basins refreshing springs of water, and let down hosts of sparkling, brawling streams, which wander away to form deep rivers, destined to bear on their broad bosoms the inland commerce of an empire. Its snowy summit condenses the invisible vapor of the atmosphere into clouds, which go floating through the air, freighted with fertility, dropping plenty over a thirsty land.

Nature does not map herself out into compartments, as our sciences classify her. It is we who are the map-makers. We scrawl these lines of metes and bounds over her surface, and mar her divine unity by our own inventions. Our feeble intellects cannot grasp her majestic grandeur, and we therefore are compelled thus to study her piecemeal. But underneath all our lines the unity remains unchanged; and it is well, now and then, to attempt for a moment to forget our artificial arrangements, and strive to see the harmonious plan on which this universal frame is built.

It is in this spirit that we propose to call attention to the study of the atmosphere, and to throw out a few hints, illus-



trating the harmonies between this invisible ocean and the living things which depend upon it for support.

Its influence on the spirit and imagination has been universally felt and acknowledged. Who has not, on a bright summer's day, lain supine, looking up, through an interlacement of boughs and successive stories of shimmering leaves, into the deep blue sky beyond, which, as the vision, by intent gazing, grows keener and penetrates more deeply, seems to recede ever more and more into illimitable space,—a transparent, unfathomable ocean of azure? A dreamy, delicious languor steeps all our senses;—we do not think, we muse; and the idea of immensity sinks like a revelation into our passive spirits. Who has not watched the pomp of evening clouds gathering about the sinking sun, and fancied he saw glimpses of the innermost glory, and the gleam of the opening gates of heaven? Who has not in the still starlight, listened to the desolate sighing of the night-wind, and fancied he heard a choir of spirits chaunting a doleful *miserere* over some guilty soul, just about to take its final flight from earth? But these harmonies between matter and spirit are not to form the theme of our present studies. We leave them to the poets, and turn our attention to the physical relations of the atmosphere with man, which we shall see in the light of science, a light that does not, as some openly suppose, want warmth and richness and changefulness.

To form a correct conception of the atmosphere, we must imagine a vast ocean, shoreless, unbroken by islands, encompassing the entire globe. On the bottom of this aerial ocean, we live at an unfathomable depth beneath its surface, weighed down by we know not how many miles of air. What we do know, however, is that it has weight, as every one must have experienced for himself when he has attempted to walk against a gale, for he has then felt the momentum of moving air, and momentum, as every tyro in mechanics knows, is the combination of weight and velocity. Besides this, curious philosophers have weighed the air in their balances, and they have taught the mariner and all others, who take an interest

in the weather, to weigh it, by means of the barometer, a simple instrument, a column of mercury in a tube. A graduated scale shows the number of inches of mercury which counterbalance the column of air. Knowing the weight of such a column of mercury, we of course know that of a column of air having the same base. We learn then that, in round numbers, the weight of a cylinder of air, an inch square and as high as the atmosphere, is equal to 15 pounds, so that a man of ordinary size takes up a daily burden of over 13 tons, when the atmosphere is lightest, and the earth sustains a pressure equal to that of a globe of lead sixty miles in diameter. Fortunately for us, this does not come upon us with a direct, heavy pressure like lead, or it would crush the life out of us. The air is also elastic, and insinuating itself into every pore of our frame, buoys us up against this tremendous weight.

The changes in the pressure of this aerial ocean are great. Like the watery sea, it has its waves rising high towards the fancied empyrean of the ancients. The barometer faithfully records these swells and tides, and teaches us that when they are removed from any perturbing influence, they follow very closely the variations of temperature.

"The horary oscillations of the barometer," says Humboldt, (*Cosmos* I, 320,) "which in the tropics present two maxima, (viz: at 9 or  $9\frac{1}{4}$  A. M., and  $10\frac{1}{2}$  or  $10\frac{3}{4}$  P. M., and two minima at 4 or  $4\frac{1}{4}$  P. M., and 4 A. M., occurring, therefore, in almost the hottest and coldest hours,) have long been the object of my most careful diurnal and nocturnal observations. Their regularity is so great, that, in the day-time especially, the hour may be ascertained from the height of the mercurial column, without an error, on the average, of more than fifteen or seventeen minutes. In the torrid zone of the new continent, on the coasts, as well as at elevations of nearly 13,000 feet above the level of the sea, where the mean temperature falls to  $44^{\circ} 6'$ , I have found the regularity of the ebb and flow of the aerial ocean undisturbed by storms, hurricanes, rain, and earthquakes."

In most places, however, there are many circumstances which modify the regularity of these waves so that they rise

in turbulent storms instead of swelling in gentle tides. These fluctuations carry the barometer from a little above 28 inches to a trifle below 31.

Some very remarkable effects of these oscillations are observable on the surface of great expanses of water. They are peculiarly frequent upon our great lakes. Governor Clinton's memoir on this subject, published in the proceedings of the New York Literary and Philosophical Society, contains numerous particular instances of this curious phenomenon. We feel that the introduction of one of these accounts requires no apology, and we accordingly quote from the paper alluded to:

"On the 30th of May, 1823, a little after sunset, Lake Erie, on the British side, was observed to take a sudden and extraordinary rise, the weather being fine and clear and the lake calm and smooth. It was principally observed at the mouths of Otho and Kettle creeks, which are twenty miles apart. At Otho creek it came in without the least previous intimation, in a swell of nine feet perpendicular height, as was afterwards ascertained, rushed violently up the channel, drove a schooner of 35 tons burthen from her moorings, threw her upon high ground, and rolled over the ordinary beach into the woods, completely inundating all the adjacent flats. This was followed by two others of equal height which caused the creek to retrograde a mile and a half and to overflow its banks where water was never before seen, by seven or eight feet. The noise occasioned by its rushing with such rapidity was truly astonishing. It was witnessed by a number of persons.

"At Kettle creek, several persons were drawing a fish-net in the lake, when suddenly they saw the water coming upon them in the manner above described, and letting go their net they ran for their lives. The swell overtook them before they could reach the high bank, and swept them forward with great force, but being expert swimmers they escaped unhurt. The man who was in the skiff, pulling in the sea-line, was driven with it a considerable distance over the flat, and grounded on a small eminence where he remained until the water subsided. There were three successive swells as at Otho Creek, and the effects were the same, with this difference, the water rose only seven feet. In both cases, the lake, after the swells had spent their force, gradually subsided,

and in about twenty minutes was at its usual height and tranquillity."

The most probable explanation of this remarkable phenomenon, is that which attributes it to sudden changes in the pressure of the atmosphere, probably at a distance from the point at which the phenomenon is observed. A change in the level of the fluid in the barometer, would be attended by a corresponding change of level in the ocean, but the water would rise higher than the mercury, and would show the change sooner. This we learn from the water-barometer, which fluctuates and pulsates before a storm, even when the mercurial barometer exhibits no change. As this effect is often produced suddenly, the atmospheric changes may cause a perpendicular rise and fall in the manner of a wave, greater than that which would depend upon the mere alterations of weight.

This change puts on or takes off from the human body more than a ton weight. Now, although it is true of the entire body that it is buoyed from within by the same fluid, so that its fibres float as it were in the atmosphere, yet there must be some ultimate film of tissue, which feels the change. Hence the effect of barometric changes upon human health. Invalids are acutely sensible to these alterations of pressure.

A slight investigation will serve to show us the admirable adaptation of this pressure to our physical wants. Any great change would be productive of serious discomfort. Thus persons who descend in diving-bells feel the increased pressure upon their ears. They dare not speak above a whisper on account of the painful reverberations of the condensed air. On the other hand, those who ascend in balloons, or climb great mountain heights, complain of the diminished pressure. They tell us of their panting and difficult respiration in the atmosphere, of the starting of blood from nose and ears—of the feeble noises and whispering voices on the cold summits. De Saussure is believed to have sacrificed his life to his zeal for science, which urged him to repeated ascents of Mont Blanc.



But there is another unpleasantness that would attend any decided diminution of atmospheric pressure. It is an undeniable fact, unromantic as it may sound, that dinner is the great central point about which very many lives revolve. The table is the Mecca of many a plethoric citizen's devout adoration—the shrine of his daily pilgrimage. How the worthy souls would tremble if they knew how much of their happiness hangs upon a few inches of barometric mercury. Let that magical liquid fall but a little, and farewell to all those luxuries which depend upon boiling for the development of their virtues. Should so sad a revolution take place, alas for the lovers of turtle-soup! Even boiled eggs would be a luxury to be enjoyed upon some more highly favored planet. For it is incontestibly proved that the lower the atmospheric pressure, the colder the temperature of boiling water. Indeed, in the matter of eggs, direct experiment has established that melancholy fact. The philosophers who ascended Mont Blanc took some eggs with them, and attempted to cook them, but the water boiled away and left the eggs raw.

This diminution of the temperature of boiling water corresponds so exactly to that of atmospheric pressure, that Wolleston's thermometer has become one of the most delicate instruments for taking the altitude of various elevations. These instruments have been constructed of sufficient delicacy to indicate the difference of temperature between water boiling on a table and on the floor beside it. On the summit of the Andes, water boils at a temperature below that of our average summer heat.

Still further, should the air become much lighter than it is at present, evaporation from all waters would go on with greatly increased rapidity. Now the more rapid the evaporation from any surface, the cooler will that surface become, so that the earth would be rapidly chilled below the temperature necessary to bring its fruits to perfection, if any great diminution in atmospheric pressure were to befall it.

One word more in regard to this property of the atmosphere. It is upon it that we are entirely dependent for the introduction of

air into our lungs. These organs are as exactly adapted to the present condition of our atmosphere, as any part of a machine is arranged in reference to another by a skillful mechanic. Our ribs are so swung upon our spines, that a simple lifting motion must increase the diameter of the chest in one direction, while a movable partition is so arranged that it augments the vertical diameter. Now the lungs being fitted, air-tight, in the cavity of the chest, must follow its motions, because, as the pressure is taken off, the air within is rarefied, and the outer air being heavier, must necessarily rush in to restore the equilibrium. The ascent of the movable partition and the descent of the ribs, expel an amount equivalent to that which was taken in, and so a perpetual flux and reflux of air goes on within these organs, to vivify the blood, as we shall presently see.

Another most important matter to be considered in studying the atmosphere, is its moisture. If, on the hottest and driest day in summer, a glass be filled with ice-water, a haze is immediately perceived upon its outer surface. This cloud gradually thickens, a dew stands in small beads upon the glass, and presently the moisture begins to flow in little channels down its sides. Now whence came this moisture? Manifestly from the air, which holds an invisible vapor, as the pores of a sponge hold water. When it is cooled, since a certain degree of heat is necessary to keep this vapor diffused, the atmosphere deposits the moisture in the form of dew, which settles upon the cold substance, whatever it may be.

The uses of this vapor are numerous. In the first place, plants and animals could not exist for any length of time in perfectly dry air. Their tissues all contain a certain quantity of fluid, which is absolutely necessary to their existence, so that, since dry air absorbs water with great avidity, leaves would speedily be withered and fruits shriveled in an atmosphere devoid of moisture. Nor would we fare any better. Three-fourths of our entire weight are made up of water, which is diffused all through our frames. This would soon be exhaled, were the air we breathe perfectly dry, and we should be reduced to mummies.

The terrible effects which dry air is capable of producing may

be seen in the accounts we have of the prevalence of that scourge of the desert, the Simoom, a wind which, in its long journey over the arid wastes of Sahara, has parted with the greater portion of its moisture. The frightened traveler, who sees the pale gleam of the coming terror, wraps his head in his cloak and throws himself upon the ground. The patient camel, knowing the danger, plunges its nose in the sand, and all wait till the scourge has passed over. Woe to the unhappy wretch who has neglected to take these precautions. Like a subtle fire pervading every fibre of his frame, the deadly blast withers his life. The hot air, greedy for water, has absorbed the fluid from his body and dried up the springs of life at their source.

The world of plants, too, feels the blessings of this absorbing power of the air. All day long, through the warm sunny hours, evaporation is going on. Every watery surface, every dank glade, every moist forest mould, is sending up its steam. All day long the air fills its invisible cisterns with the beneficent moisture. The amount of this evaporation may be imagined, when we learn, from direct estimation, that nearly 80 cubic miles of water are annually poured into the atmosphere from the valley of the St. Lawrence alone.

This is calculated by determining the amount sent over the Falls of Niagara in a given space of time, and then the depth of rain falling upon the country drained by this mighty river. Thus, the quantity of water passing into the Niagara river, at Black Rock, has been estimated at 22,440,000 feet in a minute, or about 80 1-8 cubic miles in a year. This is equivalent to a depth of 15 inches over the entire valley. Now the annual fall of rain is about 30 inches, and it is this rain which feeds all the head waters of the river. The evaporation, therefore, reduces this to one-half, so that what ascends in the air is about equal to that which plunges over the rocks at the cataract. Such a result as this leads us to attach some importance to Franklin's speculations on this subject. That eminent philosopher thought that many rivers might truly be said to empty, not into the sea, but into the air, because the evaporation was sufficient to drain them.

The warm hours of the day being over, and the source of heat

being removed, the earth begins to cool. Like all heated bodies, it throws off its warmth, by radiating it in straight lines from every point of its surface. The coolness of the solid bodies is gradually imparted to the air which bathes them, and this fluid deposits its moisture upon the leaves and grass. It is interesting to observe how even the dew has been economized. The plants, being the chief pensioners upon the bounty of the atmosphere, have been specially provided for. The smooth green surface of their leaves has been so constructed that, by radiating more rapidly, it cools faster than other surfaces. So while the beaten, barren road, and the hard pavement and the unproductive gravel-walk remain dry, the plants drink in delighted the benignant dew. Every leaf is dripping with cool humidity; every blade of grass is strung with glittering beads; every little flower holds up its tiny chalice for a draught; every humble weed bows its modest head to receive the silent baptism. It is this which enables plants to sustain the protracted droughts of summer, and it is to be observed that that soil which gives up its moisture most parsimoniously, suffers less from drought than others which allow it readily to escape.

Nor is it only in dew that this moisture is let down upon the thirsty earth. The mountain tops condense it, and the thick mists that bind their hoary brows with a cloudy diadem, gather into drops that feed their springs, and finally form our rivers. The air, too, has its condensations going on in its upper regions. The warm current, which has risen from the equator loaded with moisture, mists the cold current coming from the icy barrier of the pole. The two commingle and assume a medium temperature. But air of this medium temperature cannot hold so much vapor as the two separate currents contained before their union. The moisture is therefore condensed into vesicles, clouds are formed, and the bright rain leaps joyously down to the glad earth. Thus the hot vapor which is now rising from the damp valleys of the Amazon, may soon fall in snow upon the cold plains of Canada, and the steam of the deadly gunpowder which is fast blasting human lives at Sevastopol may descend in fertilizing showers upon the orange groves of Spain or the wheat-fields of Russia



Nature delights in bringing life out of death, and organizing beauty out of decay. It is this continuous circulation from the sea to the air, from the air to the land, from the land back to the sea again, that keeps our springs welling and our rivers flowing.

Nor does it only supply the needful moisture to plants and animals. It also promotes our comfort by washing out the countless impurities of the atmosphere. From all the reeking sinks of corruption; from the sooty chimneys of the factory; from the dusty road; from the turbulent sea; all imaginable varieties of volatile filth are steaming up into the air. A most noisome atmosphere, "a pestilent collection of vapors" they would soon make of it, were it not that the blessed rain sweeps them back to their native earth, there to be transmuted to more wholesome forms.

If we could but follow the mutations of a single particle of water, in its constant oscillation between life and death, we would be admitted to the perusal of a truly wonderful history, the vague outlines of which our imaginations can but feebly portray.

The consideration of the electrical condition of the atmosphere would lead us too far from our subject. It is impossible, however, to refrain from calling attention to the influence which it exerts upon human health. It is undoubtedly true that electricity is a powerful stimulant to all the functions of a living being. Plants grow more rapidly, flowers earlier, and are in every way more precocious when supplied with an extra quantity of this mysterious agent. The nervous system of animals, to which it acts as a direct stimulant, is very much under its control, and it is not improbable that when our means of investigation are sufficiently improved, we shall discover that many of the irregularities of nervous disease proceed from some modifications in the condition of this subtle fluid. It is, however, too early to speculate upon this matter, since we are as yet in total ignorance of all the connecting facts between the two extremes of our observations. We only know, on the one hand, that all the changes in our bodies are attended with electrical disturbances, and that exterior electrical disturbances modify these changes. Our knowledge, in this particular, resembles a broken chain of which we have lost the intermediate links.

An indirect influence upon life atmospheric electricity undoubtedly exerts; an influence which we can see and appreciate, for it certainly controls the fall of rain, and the lapse of dew. It is also powerful to develop certain chemical combinations, which are of no little importance to our well-being, and which we shall notice in due time. It manifestly affects the magnetic needle, since the daily variations of that valuable instrument coincide with the fluctuations of the electrical condition of the atmosphere. A constant interchange of electricity takes place between the earth and the air. The evaporation of water, the vital activity of plants, the respiration of animals, are so many disturbing influences from which electrical changes originate. The equilibrium thus lost is restored by continual currents from the air to the earth, and more suddenly and violently by the vivid lightning. These currents, interchanging with those of the earth, may control the direction of the needle, and as evaporation is one of the causes which produce them, the very fog that bewilders the mariner may have something to do with that power that guides him safely through it, that Archæus or living instinct of the ship, which, unerringly as a revelation, directs its silent way across the solemn vastness of the pathless deep.

The temperature of the air is intimately connected with the comfort and happiness of us all. The causes of its changes we shall not stop to consider. To the physical geographer it belongs to take his stand upon some "mount of vision" and survey the magnificent panorama of the world; great oceans heaving under the changing moon; long waving lines of coast indented with deep bays and embossed with jagged promontories, here receding till but a line of land remains between the lashing waves of two seas, and there spreading out in broad savannahs; mountains shifting the course of the winds; great forests keeping up a perpetual dampness under their umbrageous boughs, arid deserts warming half a continent, and broad ice-plains tempering with their cool breath the fervor of a distant sky. We have only to do with the influence of heat upon life. It is the lower strata of the atmosphere that are heated, when they rest upon the earth; higher up the thin air is as cold as Greenland, even under the full

blaze of a tropical sun. The Andes, where the equator crosses their jagged peaks, are capped with perpetual snow.

No where is the influence of heat upon life more distinctly seen than in the ascent of one of these high tropical mountains. On the plain at its base the traveler rests under the shadow of a palm tree and looks out upon fields of vanilla and groves of banana. He soon passes beyond these, but still finds pine-apples and oranges around him. As he gradually ascends, these disappear in their turn; vineyards, heavy with their luscious clusters meet his eye, and wheat begins to nod its golden ears yellow-ripe for the harvest. These regions passed, the sturdy oak throws shadows over his head from its brown arms, and waving grass receives the imprint of his foot. Pines succeed, and girdle the steep slope with a belt of gloomy green, but he observes, as he continues to mount, that even these become dwarfed to straggling, ragged shrubs. After them come mosses, and then hard leathery lichens coat the scarcely harder stone, till at last even these disappear, and only the cold white surface of unchanging snow remains, a fit shroud for those regions of everlasting death.

This tropical mountain is but the analogue of the great globe, and what it displays in the few miles of its ascent, the earth shows in successive girdles from the equator to the poles. It is the varying supply of heat that thus controls the character of vegetation, the products of agriculture. Nor is its influence on the distribution of animal life less decided, as any one may see who will take the trouble to run his eye over a table of the animals in the different zones. In the torrid zone, where heat is at its maximum, he will also find the greatest exuberance and variety of life. The number of individuals, of species, of genera is greater than any where else. These steadily diminish till near the poles, where the shaggy white bear, the unwieldy walrus, and a few other animals roam upon the outskirts of existence.

Upon man, too, the varying temperature of the air exerts its influence. Though emphatically a cosmopolite, capable of enduring the fiery heat of the tropics and the pinching cold of the polar zones, he is nevertheless decidedly affected by varying degrees of heat. Civilization is the growth of a

temperate climate, and has never permanently flourished any where else. Arts and empire follow the fortunate denizens of that favored zone, and they spread their tents over the whole globe. To them belongs the energy that triumphs over obstacles;—theirs are the steam engine, the printing press, the electric telegraph. As you recede from their native home, either towards the pole or the equator, the physical and mental character of the race changes. The dwarf and swarthy Lapps, and Finns, and Esquimaux, tell how hard it is for physical development to coincide with the coldness of the frigid zone; while the languor of India, and the unreclaimable barbarism of Africa, seem to show that too great heat is not consistent with full mental development. Undoubtedly, other causes operate, but it is certainly worthy of remark that the civilization of Egypt, such as it was, has utterly died out, while China has retained her ancient glory; the arts still flourish in all those regions which were overshadowed by the wings of Cæsar's eagles, and the armed heel of stupid, barbaric despotism has not, in all these centuries, been able to trample out the last spark of Grecian intellect and freedom.

If we examine the chemical constitution of the air, we shall find harmonies as exact between it and man. It is essentially composed of a mixture of two gases, oxygen and nitrogen, nearly in the proportion of one to four—both colorless, both elastic, but differing widely in chemical character. The first of these is the great supporter of all combustion, and of all life. By its aid we are enabled to make a fire,—*i.e.* to civilize ourselves. This act of making fire draws a clear line between man and other animals. The most cultivated monkey has not reached this pitch of refinement, which is the first act of the wildest savage who desires to make himself comfortable. It is not to be wondered at that the ancients venerated this potent element, for, in sober verity, our civilization depends upon fire. Say we could not kindle it—what then? The blacksmith would be a nonentity;—we could not work iron. This strong ally of man in all his con-



quests over brute nature would lie locked up idle and inglorious in the everlasting hills, and with it would be entombed our civilization. We should be compelled to go back to the rough wigwam of the savage. The arts would be limited to efforts so rude, that the wildest living barbarian would be ashamed of them. The sciences would be impossible; for the absence of fire would imply the absence of all the metals as well as of iron, and—what is equally important—the absence of glass, without which the scientific man would be helpless. Agriculture would go back to its infancy. The plow, the hoe, the spade, the scythe, would be unknown, and the farmer would be reduced to turning up the ground with a forked stick, and scattering a few seeds over the broken earth. But it would not stop here. Without fire, the greater part of the earth would be overspread with a tangled wilderness, in which not even a solitary savage could exist, which could give harbor only to the wild beast. The inhabited parts would be confined to a comparatively narrow strip on either side of the equator.

So far, we have gone upon the assumption that a gas, which could not support combustion, might nevertheless be capable of sustaining life. From what we know of oxygen, however, it is probable that the same property which allows fire, permits life also; and consequently, without it, the earth would be an uninhabited and uninhabitable desert.

An atmosphere of oxygen alone, however, would not at all harmonize with the existing condition of things. In the pure gas, all combustibles burn with great brilliancy and rapidity—animals are violently stimulated, and metals speedily corrode. An atmosphere of it would soon desolate the earth. The smallest spark would set the world on fire, and the conflagration could not cease till every thing combustible had been consumed. Animals would live too fast, and wear themselves out in a very short time. It must therefore be diluted, and this dilution is effected by the admixture of nitrogen.

This is a colorless, tasteless, inodorous gas, the properties

of which are usually expressed by negatives. It does not support combustion or animal life, and yet it is not poisonous. A lighted candle goes out in it, an animal dies in it,—and both results take place in consequence of the absence of oxygen.

There is still another gas diffused in small quantities through the air—carbonic acid, a deadly enemy to life and heat. It puts out all fires, extinguishes all life, and, unlike nitrogen, it is actively poisonous, even when largely diluted with air. It is composed of oxygen and carbon, an element well known to every body in its common forms of charcoal and lamp-black. It is a heavy gas—much heavier than the atmosphere, so that it can be poured through it like water. Its sources are numerous. Every fire, every gas-light, every breathing animal, pours it forth into the air. Volcanoes send it out from their fiery hearts, and it steams up here and there through fissures in the earth's surface.

When a piece of dry wood is burned, its ashes alone remain behind. The rest of it, however, is not destroyed; it is dissipated in the air. These volatile products may be, and, in the progress of chemical analysis, are constantly collected. They are found to be, when the combustion is complete, water and carbonic acid. The same ingredients are formed during the slow decay of beings that once had life,—nay, they even take place during life itself. If we breathe through an apparatus similar to that which we use for collecting the products of combustion, we shall find that we are giving off the same compounds, water and carbonic acid. We shall presently see the significance of these facts.

The quantity of this acid gas introduced into the atmosphere from so many sources is perfectly appalling—sufficient in a short time to extinguish all fire and destroy all life upon the surface of the earth. Were it to accumulate in any quantity, it would form a vast sea of deadly vapor, the terrible effects of which may be imagined if we bear in mind the famous Upas valley of Java. This is a lake of carbonic acid, oval in form, half a mile in circumference, and totally

devoid of vegetation. There is nothing about it except the bleaching skeletons of men and animals to warn the unwary traveler of its fatal power. Unless cautioned beforehand, he wanders on deeper and deeper among the scattered stones, till a sudden drowsiness overpowers him. He falls, and soon renders up his life, and adds another heap of bones to the ghastly trophies of the valley.

Such an atmosphere we should soon have over the whole earth, were it not for a benevolent modification of the common laws of elasticity in the case of gases. These expand, not only in empty space, when the pressure of their own superincumbent strata is removed, but also through one another's pores; so that, if two gases of different densities are mixed, they do not subside in the order of their relative weights, but diffuse themselves equally over the entire space. Hence the heavy carbonic acid, though generated upon the surface, does not remain there, but slowly rises, and diffuses itself equally through the whole atmosphere.

It is manifest, however, that even this provision does not afford a sufficient protection to animal life; for though the poison is in this manner constantly carried off from the place of its origin, yet, as it is steadily generated, the whole bulk of air must in time contain a fatal quantity. Some contrivance for its permanent withdrawal must therefore be devised. We find this provision in the vegetable kingdom. Carbonic acid, so fatal to animals, constitutes an essential portion of the food of plants; without it, they would perish of actual starvation. Every leaf that flutters in the air is furnished with numerous pores to absorb this gas. Entering the tubes of the plant, it is there digested; the carbon is appropriated and enters into the substance of the vegetable, forming woody fibre or other tissue. Thus this generation may be said to warm itself by the breath of its buried ancestors, since the carbon exhaled from their lungs has hardened into the very wood we now consume. Nor does it only fix the carbon. The oxygen which was combined with it is given off, and mixes with the atmosphere, which is thus continually purified

by the renewal of its vivifying ingredient. Seen from this point of view, we find new virtues in the world of plants. The humblest little ragged, dusty weed, struggling for life on the hard roadside, is faithfully performing its share of this beneficent duty. Even the "green mantle of the stagnant pool" does not exist for itself alone, and is not altogether useless, but sends up its little contribution to the health of the world.

Diametrically opposite to this is the action of animals upon atmospheric air. Their more energetic vitality demands more rapid changes in the chemical constitution of their component parts. The great element of all these changes is oxygen, as it freely unites with every simple substance that enters into the structure of animals, and by very slight additions, greatly modifies the form and function of a compound. In this manner numerous substances, necessary in various parts of the body, are combined.

Furthermore, during the various changes consequent upon nutrition and other vital acts, many half-way substances are formed, substances which are still in a state of change, of molecular agitation, and consequently extremely prone to produce serious disorder in the system. When we have such noxious things outside of us, such for example as clothing saturated with the poison of typhus or small-pox, how do we dispose of them? By burning them--the cleansing action of fire dissipates them in gases of comparatively innocuous properties, by forcing them rapidly to combine with oxygen. So in the animal body, these malignant compounds are burned. We see no light and yet the combustion is perfect, as any one may know who will take the trouble to breathe through an apparatus prepared for organic analysis. It is a dark fire but it gives out its heat.

Not only these, but certain portions of the food, are thus disposed of: indeed they are introduced for the express purpose of being burned. They are the fuel of the system, and convert the recent division of food into alimentary and respiratory. Sugar and fuel are the chief sources of animal



heat, and must be continually supplied, because the body is continually cooling. The rate of cooling, of course, differs in different climates; and hence the amount of carbon necessary to keep up the natural heat of the body, which is the same in Guinea and in Greenland, must vary. We need not then wonder that the Samoieds eat candles and drink train-oil in incredible quantities, any more than that the people of Maine burn more wood in the winter than those of Mississippi. The inhabitant of the Arctic circle requires a large quantity of internal fuel to make up for the coldness of the air about him.

This is a point of no little consequence in dietetics. Every body knows that if he fills his stove too full of fuel, it burns with difficulty—and gives off an undue amount of smoke and soot; or if he raises the wick of his lamp too high its flame is red and smoky, and covers his furniture with lamp-black. Why does this happen? Because the amount of fuel is too great for the quantity of oxygen which can get access to it. So too, if a man crowds into his system more carboniferous nutriment than his lungs can dispose of, the soot must clog his internal organs. Hence the liver diseases which assail great feeders in hot climates. An Englishman goes to the East Indies, and wonders that his appetite does not return with his meals, and that he can no longer relish the substantial fare which used to delight him in his cold, moist, native climate. Unskilled properly to interpret the motherly warning of nature, he thinks only of stimulating his flagging appetite by brandy and hot spices. A speedy death or life-long ill health is the result of the unfortunate experiment.

These errors influence even the condition of nations and the progress of civilization, a point so clearly stated by Liebig, in his Familiar Letters, that we prefer to quote his words.

“Man, when confined to animal food, requires for his support and nourishment extensive sources of food, even more widely extended than lions and tigers, because when he has the opportunity, he kills without eating.

“A nation of hunters, on a limited space, is utterly incapable of increasing its numbers beyond a certain point, which is soon attained. The carbon necessary for respiration must

be obtained from the animals, of which only a limited number can live on the space supposed. The animals collect from plants the constituents of their organs and of their blood, and yield them in turn, to the savages who live by the chase alone. They, again, receive this food unaccompanied by those compounds, destitute of nitrogen, which, during the life of the animals, served to support the respiratory process.

“While the savage with one animal and an equal weight of stock could maintain life and health for a certain number of days, he would be compelled, if confined to flesh alone, in order to procure the carbon necessary for respiration, during the same time, to consume five such animals. His food contains an excess of plastic matter; during the greater part of the year, that which is wanting is the respiratory material which ought to accompany the sanguineous food. Hence the tendency to brandy-drinking, always observed in men who live on flesh exclusively.

“The practical view of agriculture cannot be more clearly or profoundly conceived than it was by the North American chief, whose speech on the subject is reported by Crèvecoeur. The chief, in recommending agriculture to his tribe, the Mississieu Indians, said: ‘Do you not see that the whites live on corn, but we on flesh? that the flesh requires more than thirty months to grow, and is often scarce? that every one of the wonderful seeds which they scatter on the soil, returns them more than a hundred-fold? that the flesh has four legs to run away and we only two to catch it? that the seeds remain and grow where the white man sows them? that winter, which for us is the season for laborious hunts, is to them a time of rest? It is for these reasons that they have so many children, and live longer than we do; I say, then, to every one who hears me, before the trees above our heads shall have died of age, before the maples of the valleys cease to yield us sugar, the race of the sowers of corn will have extirpated the race of flesh-eaters, unless the hunters resolve also to sow.’

“In his difficult and laborious life of the chase, the Indian consumes in his limbs a large sum of force, but the effect produced is very trifling, and bears no proportion to the expense.

“Cultivation is the economy of force. Science teaches us the simplest means of obtaining the *greatest effect* with the *smallest* expenditure of power, and with given means to produce a maximum of force. The unprofitable exertion of power, the waste of force in agriculture, in other branches of industry, in

science, or in social economy, is characteristic of the savage state, or of the want of true civilization."

It would be entirely foreign to our present purpose to enter into a minute description of the minute anatomical arrangements, by which the due aeration is secured. It is known to every body that the lungs are the chief organs through which air is admitted to the blood. These are loose, freely expansible, permeated in every direction by tubes, which terminate in cells having walls of extreme tenacity. Over these ramify blood vessels, forming a close net work. The dark venous blood is sent out from the right side of the heart, and passes along these vessels, separated from the air by only two layers of very delicate membrane. Now this venous blood contains carbonic acid, which passes through the animal membrane and escapes into the air-cells, while the oxygen gas brought in by the act of respiration, takes its place in the blood. The vital fluid, circulating to every part, carries with it this powerful agent, which burns the carbon in the extreme vessels, thus giving rise to the carbonic acid so abundant in venous blood.

How beautiful are the harmonies of nature. The destruction of the animal furnishes food to plants, the refuse of the plant gives life to animals. We have said already that the results of respiration and of the burning of wood are the same. Their effect is also the same—the evolution of heat. We are all wasting away. Life is indeed a slow combustion, and after death the embers continue to smoulder till nothing is left of us but ashes and vapor. But these vapors do not hover over the cold tomb. The chemist follows them with his penetrating eye and sees them assuming new and ever-varied forms. He beholds the verification of the poetical prophecy:—

"From her unpolluted dust  
Shall violets spring."

He sees the chain of life binding together ocean, earth, and air, and finds its hidden links even in the darkness of the grave. He perceives how, while life and death go ever hand in hand through this world of ours, the lighter spirit is ever

the stronger. Death may paralyze one life, but a thousand spring from its ashes.

In the examination of this subject, we are led into a startling paradox—startling, but susceptible of rigorous demonstration. Not only does death presuppose life, but life is inseparable from death—it is impossible without death—it depends upon death—in one word, it is death. We all talk about the breath of life, and recognize the act of respiration as essential to existence. But we have already shown that respiration is a process of oxydation—of destruction, as it is commonly termed. Every act we perform by which we demonstrate our life, is necessarily attended by the death of the ultimate living tissue. Does a muscle contract? Its little discs perish by thousands. Does a nerve thrill? The nervous matter dies as it feels. Does the brain act with unwonted vigor? The brain perishes in part, and its ashes are found in the excretions. In every crowded apartment, dew is found upon the windows. That dew lived an hour before, circulated in blood, throbbed in hearts, felt in nerve. Nor does that dew represent all the changes which have taken place. Some portions that lived when the people entered the room, are dead and hidden in the transparent chambers of the air. They are not lost, but float about in the atmosphere, ready to undergo new mutations and live in other forms. They blush in next summer's roses, or harden into pine timber this winter. The particles which now leave our bodies, converted into fuel, may warm those of our children, or they may go still farther. Passing through the vegetable world, they may serve to nourish animals; may flash in the eye of the eagle, or throb in the heart of the dove, or blush on the cheek of beauty. Of one thing be certain. They cannot be lost. They are indestructible as eternity, and to annihilate them would require no lower a strain of omnipotence than that which was exerted to call them from their original nonentity.

We have found in the atmosphere, three elements—oxygen, nitrogen and carbon. In its watery vapor we have a fourth, hydrogen. Out of these four, with the addition of some salts that come from the soil, are formed all the tissues and secretions of plants and animals. Thus all living things are formed from



the air and the soil. All the available water of plants, leaving out the sea-weeds, comes from the air in the form of rain, and was previously diffused through it as vapor. Plants stand between us and the organic world. They separate from air and soil these necessary ingredients, and then give them to us as food.

Schleiden treats this subject with his usual elegance:

“In the Pampas of South America,” he says, “existed at the period of their occupation by the Spaniards, the same thirsty vegetation of the steppes as at present, excepting that the immediate vicinity of the towns has been altered by the running wild of the great Pampas thistle and the artichoke, the same scanty population, the same quantity of indigenous animals, that now wander over its desert plains. The Spaniards introduced the horse and neat cattle; these multiplied in an incredibly short time in such profusion, that Monte Video alone annually exports 300,000 ox-hides; that the military expeditions of General Rosas cost many hundred thousand horses, without any diminution being observable.

“The native organic life and its quantity have, therefore, since the discovery by the Spaniards, not diminished, but importantly increased, and millions of pounds of carbon and nitrogen, combined into organic substances, have been exported in the trade in hides, without the land receiving the smallest appreciable return of organic matter. Whence could these masses have come, if not from the atmosphere? If we leave out of view all the other constituents of tea, China exports more than 300,000 pounds of nitrogen in the half per cent. of them, without receiving any considerable return.

“The hay-maker of Switzerland and Tyrol mows his definite amount of grass every year on the Alps, inaccessible to cattle, and gives back not the smallest quantity of organic substance to the soil. Whence comes this hay, if not from the atmosphere? The plant requires carbon and nitrogen, and in South America, in the woods, and on the wild Alps, there is no possibility of its acquiring these matters, except from the ammonia and carbonic acid of the atmosphere.

“The northern provinces of Holland, Friesland, Groeningen and Dreuthe, export annually about a million pounds of nitrogen in their cheese. They obtain it through the cows from their meadows, which receive no manure but that from the cattle grazing thereon. The meadows receive no return by this, since all that the cows produce comes itself from the meadows. Whence, then, these enormous quantities of nitrogen? Perhaps Vesuvius

or *Ætna*, or the great fire-abysses of the Cordilleras, pour forth this abundance of carbonate of ammonia, which is carried by currents of air to the plants of the Dutch meadows, and then, through the cows, becomes, as casein, an object of trade and of delight to the palate."

It is manifest that this nitrogen must have come from the atmosphere, but the question arises, in what way? It has been rendered probable, by experience, that a portion of this nitrogen may be derived directly from the nitrogen of the atmosphere, but the greater portion of it is generally believed to come from ammonia and nitric acid. These substances are abundantly formed from the atmosphere. The *nitrières artificielles* of France supplied saltpetre enough for the gunpowder used in the early years of the wars of the Revolution, and the nitric acid so obtained came exclusively from the atmosphere. Ammonia is the result of all animal decay, and is also capable of being formed directly from the air. Charcoal, heated to redness in a stream of moist air, generates carbonic acid indeed, but we find the acid combined with ammonia. The explanation is simple. The oxygen is abstracted from both the air and the water, but in leaving the latter, it sets at liberty hydrogen, which, being in a nascent state, combines immediately with the nitrogen of the atmosphere. Iron, rusting, produces the same result. A thunder storm, also, by its repeated discharges of electricity through the moist air, causes another set of combinations to take place. Nitric acid and ammonia are both formed, and these unite to form the nitrate of ammonia, which plays an important part in the economy of nature. Falling upon the inert carbonate of lime in the soil, a double decomposition takes place, and two soluble salts, nitrate of lime and carbonate of ammonia, are ready to enter the pores of the plant.

But there is more than all this in the atmosphere. The scientific eye sees, in those blue depths, a great charnel-house into which countless remains of living things have been breathed. They are full of the products of decay in some of which the final process is not yet completed, which are indeed still dying. These substances are in a state of change, and communicate the peculiar motion of their particles to the living beings with which they

come in contact. Recent researches have gone far to show cholera is dependent upon such fermenting miasmata. They are at all times floating in the air. Invisible to us, they are nevertheless there, and pure as is the crystal vase which contains them, it is false to the old superstition, and does not betray the secret poison which has been infused into it. Inevitable as death are these his active ministers. When, from any cause, they are present in undue quantity, then comes the pestilence. No one can refuse them; they are absorbed with every breath we draw, and diffuse the dire venom through our burning veins.

So goes the scourge, wandering silently and invisibly through the still air, till its own time comes. The hazy atmosphere becomes bright and cool; a new power has sprung to birth. Like an elemental fire, it leaps through the clear air, consuming these deadly atoms which cannot exist in its presence. The pestilence ceases; the newly smitten recover, and the cloud of death rolls away from the redeemed city.

Though long exerting its benign influence, this substance remained till lately unnamed and unknown. Schoenbein discovered it and named it *ozone*. What it is can hardly be determined. Some chemists regarding it as a union of a large amount of oxygen with a small quantity of hydrogen, while others conceive it to be a modification of oxygen produced by electric force. Whatever may be its composition, it is certainly a most powerful oxydating agent, and renders these substances harmless by hastening their final changes to compounds of highest oxydation.

We have thus taken a rapid, and necessarily imperfect survey of the uses of the atmosphere. There remain, however, many important questions to be discussed, but it would be idle to attempt to compress these into our limited space.

Of the æsthetics of the atmosphere we have as yet said nothing, though that alone would form the subject of a distinct treatise. We are indebted to it for all the visible beauties of nature and art; for all the audible delights we experience.

It is to the air we owe all the vegetation which covers the surface of the earth. Were it not for it, this green earth would be an unsightly heap of ruins; the monument of the Titanic

struggle of the early geological forces. Those primeval throes of the world have indeed left their trace upon the surface of our planet. Great mountains still record that awful time when the earth heaved like a stormy sea, but was checked, its mighty surges silenced for ever in their strongest heaves. Deep chasms are the scars of those early conflicts ; but the atmosphere has smoothed the rugged harshness of the outline of this mighty ruin. Gray lichens, and green moss, and waving grass, and shadowy forest trees have successively appeared upon the hard rock, till the gentle slope of green lawns, and the round swell of grassy hills have taken the place of pointed pinnacles and dreary chasms without the atmosphere, every fracture would have retained its original sharpness. Great splinters of rock ; deep angular rifts in the globe's stony crust ; desolate rivers of lava, would alone break the dreary monotony of the surface. The mellow haze of autumn ; the dewy lustre of spring ; the shimmering glare of summer ; the white glitter of winter, would be alike impossible. The soft, ethereal purple of the distant mountain, and the unspeakably beautiful lights and shadows which make it look like a dream of fairy-land, would be unknown. The evening pomp of gorgeous clouds ; the growing glory of the morning ; the ruddy glow of the snow-capped mountain, as it kindles its unconsumed holocaust of light on its lofty altar, could not exist. All the soft shadows and middle tints of objects would vanish. A harsh, unpleasant glare would meet us as we faced the sun ; a black night would receive us as we turned from him. This bright blue firmament, with all its loveliness, would pass away, and we would have only a jetty dome bending over us.

Sounds, too, would be banished from this dreary ball. The melody of birds ; the slumberous bass of the waterfall ; the sighing of winds ; the roar of ocean would be over. No aerial waves, dashing in soft breakers upon our ear-drums, would convey to our spirits intelligence of the outer world. No sweet music could clamber up the silent staircase of the ear ; no words of love could stir the still depths of the heart. The melody of bells, with all their changeful voices, could no longer speak to the human soul ; and all the sweet associations that hover round



accustomed sounds, would die in the bleak desolation. No organ tones could wake devotion; no choral voices could ascend in prayer or praise to heaven; silenced alike the wailings of the *Miserere*, and the exultant harmonies of the *Te Deum*.

Life, too, would be impossible, and the blasted globe would reel through space, an accursed desert—blind, deaf, dumb and dead.

---

ART. VII.—PARTY LEADERS. *Sketches of Thomas Jefferson, Alexander Hamilton, Andrew Jackson, Henry Clay, John Randolph, of Roanoke.* By JO. G. BALDWIN, author of "Flush Times of Alabama and Mississippi." New York: published by D. Appleton & Co., 346 & 348 Broadway; London: 16 Little Britain. 1855.

"THE design of this work," says the author in his preface, "is to give some account of the prominent events, and of some of the eminent personages, connected with the political history of the United States." "The events," he says in another part of the same, "are matters of familiar history. All that the writer has attempted has been a concise narrative of the facts, grouping them together in a compact and perspicuous shape, and with such reflections as seemed to him to be just and appropriate. If he has succeeded in this, and in giving to his narrative a fresh and attractive form, his object has been accomplished."

No one, we think, who reads Mr. Baldwin's book, will be of any other opinion than that he has been eminently successful in the modest purpose with which he set out. He has presented as many facts in a small space, in as luminous an arrangement, and in a style as vivid, sparkling and beautiful as any author whose work we have seen for some time.

The book begins with some remarks on the "American Revolution—its general character—its leaders." The author then proceeds, after the manner, and with the object, marked

out in the preface, to a review of the life, character, and political history of Thomas Jefferson. He then discusses in the same manner the great leader of the Federal party, Alexander Hamilton. He traces the career of these eminent men as they moved in their course, as political antagonists during the fiercest political strife which has ever marked even the fiercely fought field of American politics. He closes the part of the work by a chapter headed:—"Hamilton and Jefferson contrasted, their True Greatness—Conclusion."

Limited time and space will not permit us to comment on the whole of Mr. Baldwin's book, however earnest our desire to do so: we can, therefore, only look at the latest, in point of time, of these political sketches; and shall review the author's account of those "party leaders" who have so lately figured on the battle-ground of recent contest, whose giant forms have just dropped the weapons of warfare, and whose persons and character are still fresh in the memory and love of the American people.

Mr. Baldwin begins this portion of "Party Leaders" with the portraiture of the eccentric and gifted son of Virginia, John Randolph of Roanoke. He tells us of the different estimates of Randolph's character and ability, from those who, amid all his singularity and eccentricity, looked upon him as a man of the clearest and deepest thought, and of an instinctive knowledge of men and their motives of action; who believed his powers capable of effecting good to his country;—to those who saw in his fiery eloquence but the destructive lightning gleaming from the dark thunder-cloud, or in the brightest scintillations of his genius the fitful glare of insanity.

Mr. Baldwin thinks, however, that even those who did more justice to the powers of Randolph, were far below a just estimate of his true greatness. *He* regards him as a "representative man" of our country. In his own words—

"As a representative of the political-republican and social-aristocratical spirit; as a Virginian and Southron of the old regime; as a States-Rights leader of the strictest sect, adhering

to the tenets of that sect when they were abandoned by the fathers of the church; and probably even more characteristically as a Virginia conservative, abounding in love for his native State, and an unreasoning devotion to her interests, renown, customs, habitudes and institutions, resisting all changes and innovations in her organic law and ancient polity, and cherishing sectional prejudices as virtues."

The birth of Randolph in the ancient mansion of one of the families of Virginia colonial nobility; his mother—her early teachings and her early death; his desultory and imaginative reading; his boyhood among the scenes of revolutionary struggle in the Old Dominion; his bodily weakness preventing exercise and study;—are all shown us as moulding the sensitive temperament, the instinctive perception, the self-willed temper, of this remarkable man.

Randolph is exhibited to us as pre-eminently a representative of Virginia. Her institutions and manners shaped his political course, and behind her he never looked. The fertile soil of the Old Dominion had received a different class of emigrants from those whom persecution drove to the sterile coast of New England. The Cavalier and the Puritan were the sources from which sprang different developments of social life.

The gay and spirited followers of the Stuarts imparted to Virginia the laws of descent, the aristocratic manners, and the dominion of caste, which they had loved in their native land. The black slave, in Virginia, took the place of the tenant and villain in the baronial estates of England; and a brave, careless, independent people, adding to their chivalry a high pride of personal liberty, dispensed a profuse hospitality in the stately mansions which stood above the winding rivers of Eastern Virginia. Says our author—

"The feudal times and baronial manners of 'merrie England' seemed revived upon this continent. Indeed, looking down from his castle-like dwelling, over a broad sweep of wood, and water, and patrimonial fields, tilled by his hundreds of slaves, the old Virginian might well feel himself scarcely less a lord than her Saxon Franklins, or her more modern

dukes or earls. 'Old times are changed, old manners gone.' The revelry is silent in their halls; the halls gone to decay. The very site of their mansions is covered with stunted pines and sedge; and park, and garden, and field, and manor, long since worn out and deserted, are grown over with briars and the undergrowth of the returning forest, and never visited, save by the solitary sportsman in quest of the small game which has taken shelter in the covert."

Randolph, trained among these scenes and manners, makes his first political appearance during the alien and sedition excitement. Virginia,—starting out with a distrust of the Federal Constitution, fearful of all external power, jealous of being controlled by the New Englander, parting with the jurisdiction over her citizens as a father parts with the custody of a loved daughter into the untried hand of one thenceforth to rule where *he* once held the sway of affectionate authority,—*Virginia* was the first to say to the federal power, "thus far shalt thou go and no farther." True to his Virginia education, full of the enthusiasm of an ill-defined love of personal freedom, the young Randolph stood on the same rostrum with the tottering form of Patrick Henry, as a republican candidate for Congress.

"The old man eloquent," so lately a fierce denouncer of the Constitution, had in declining years, and after its adoption, come into the Federal view of its interpretation, and was there to make his last speech on the Federal side. Once more the tones of his voice, his glowing eye, his commanding gesture swayed the vast multitude as in the days of old. Henry, wearied by the exertion, too great for his feeble frame, fell back into the arms of his friends, and the undaunted stripling rose to reply. "That the crowd," says the author, "still thrilling with the eloquence of Henry, listened to him at all, that they listened attentively for three hours, that they were pleased and entertained all that time, and that the effect of the speech was to promote the interests of the youthful speaker, *is praise enough for any man's first effort.*"

In the time of the crumbling ascendancy of the Federal party under the elder Adams, Randolph took his seat in



Congress. Here began the public career of one whom the author thinks "*the* most consistent of all the politicians who ever lived in the Republic." Randolph of course took ground against the administration. Jefferson President, and a Republican majority in Congress, he was made chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means. He co-operated in all the measures of the Government. His States' Rights consistency failed him in the purchase of Louisiana, even in Mr. Baldwin's opinion; for "on strict States' Rights principles," he says "this measure was inadmissible."

Randolph at the end of Jefferson's first term stood high with his party, and had earned a wide reputation in the country, never gaining, however, personal popularity: still the same self-willed strange man; liking and respecting few, loved by few in turn.

The rumbling thunder of distant cannon was now heard on the waters of the Atlantic. Bonaparte and England struggled in the death-grasp; each striving to destroy the other. Our commerce in its infancy, and yet an infancy like that of Hercules, was rapidly extending under the carrying trade of the world. Left by the policy of Jefferson to its own defence, the merchant marine of America was daily exposed to outrage. The orders in Council and the decrees of Napoleon, equally assailed the rights of neutrals. Spain spoiled our vessels, disputed our territorial boundaries and insulted the persons of our citizens. War with all would have been justifiable; for war with none were we prepared. The hatred felt to England drew the war fury upon *her*. Jefferson was undecided. Although an ingenious politician and a strong thinker and writer, yet he was not the man of action which the crisis demanded. From this time dates Randolph's break with his party. His first stand against Jefferson was his speech against the bill appropriating two millions of dollars to be intrusted to executive discretion. The President while he did not recommend the measure, secretly gave notice of his wishes in its favor. This was reported in the House as an argument in favor of the bill, and Randolph threw upon the suggestion all

the force of his eloquence and sarcasm. "He considered it," he said, "unworthy of any man holding a seat in this House."

Through the administrations of Madison and Monroe Randolph was in opposition. The Non-Intercourse Act was followed by the Embargo. Randolph opposed both. He declared an offensive war contrary to the Constitution, and answered by a withering blast of invective every assault by the friends of the administration.

At this time he was attacked by the racking pains of hereditary disease, and on his sick bed the tortures of mental suffering were added to his bodily ills. This strange man had loved. Abandoning the idea of marrying the object of his affection, he had indulged in the fond fancy of a Platonic attachment, but the lady of his love married another. "This austere man," says the author, "proud, exclusive, repulsive, had yet in his heart, cold and hard as it seemed to the world, a spot warm and bright: amid boisterous seas, a little emerald isle decked with flowers and vocal with melody, and inhabited by the fair being whom he idolized, as the ideal of all that was pure and bright of womanhood and beautiful on earth."

We pass over the discussion of the difficulties with England. Randolph favored Monroe, as Jefferson's successor, instead of Madison. The crisis called great men into the nation's council. Clay and Calhoun stood on the theatre of their future fame. Randolph was matched against the young giants of the war party in the House. "These young men," said the sarcastic statesman, "have their eyes on the Presidential chair. We shall have war now." The second war with England began; and with it began that personal rivalry between Randolph and Clay, which lasted all their time of joint political life, and called them once into hostile combat.

Randolph and Clay were constantly in conflict. Their resemblance as passionate, enthusiastic—*speaking* representatives of the war and peace party, made them constant personal antagonists.

"It was utterly impossible," says Mr. Baldwin, "for two such men as Clay and Randolph to be friends." The admirable "contrast" between the two, which occupies nine pages of the

book, we would like to present to our readers, but they must examine for themselves.

Randolph, against popular clamor, opposed the war. True to his own opinions, he boldly maintained what he believed to be right. "As we look back," says the author, "on this scene, we are reminded of a later example of the same lofty heroism. We allude to the day when John C. Calhoun, in the American Senate, pale and emaciated, his eyes glaring and his frame quivering with excitement, lifted up his voice alone in that august body in opposition to the Mexican war, and trembling with passionate patriotism, swore he would strike a dagger to his heart before he would vote for an unjust war, heralded by a lying preamble."

Randolph loved England. His heart looked back with fondness to the ancient homestead of his Virginia sires. England, arrayed against the world, was prepared to the last gasp, says the author, "as she stood in her armor, glittering like a war-god beneath the lion banner under which we had fought with her at the Longmeadows, at Fort Du Quesne, and the Heights of Abraham, Randolph could not, for his soul he could not find it in his heart to strike her then."

The tempest of war feeling swept over the country, and Randolph fell before it for a time. He was beaten for Congress, and went into retirement.

But we must hurry on from the tale of his strange and fascinating history. We must leave the story of his religious experience; of those spiritual operations which he seems to have felt so deeply, and of which, in such touching tones, he writes to his friend Key. His nephew, the last of his line, died, and his mind bowed under the stroke, till "reason seemed driven from her throne and frightened from propriety."

Once more in political action, he is found opposing the bank and the tariff, which the democratic leaders now urged as necessary measures. War had wrought a change in the minds of the champions of State Rights, and every Federal idea was now found to be constitutional and proper. Like a rushing wave, the struggle with England had swept the foundation of Jeffersonism from beneath their feet.

But right or wrong, Randolph never turned. He still firmly opposed whatever he had once regarded as an encroachment of power; he declaimed against debts and credit with all the hatred of a Virginia landholder of the olden time. Monroe's administration and the Missouri question followed. The personal collision of Randolph and Clay still continued. The former complained of the Speaker's inattention to him on the floor, and opposed, with all his force, the "Compromise" of which Clay was the author.

About this time came Randolph's visit to England, and the making of his will emancipating his slaves. In the 18th Congress he opposed the Greek resolutions, the internal improvement bills, the tariff of 1824.

We have now reached the starting point of modern political organizations; the election of 1824; the struggle in the House; Clay's support of Adams, and the latter's election. The fatal mistake of Clay's life was his acceptance of office under this administration. Randolph, now in the Senate, offended at the tone of the President's answer to the inquiries about the publication of the documents relating to the Panama Mission, broke out into a bitter invective, concluding with the sentence, the unjustifiable, bitter, unfounded sentence which brought himself and Clay into the field. "I was defeated," said he, "broke down by the coalition of Bliffl and Black George, by the combination, unheard of till then, of the Puritan with the black-leg." The challenge passed, and Randolph and Clay met in combat. We extract the author's description of the scene presented by this remarkable meeting.

"The meeting of these remarkable men is suggestive. There stood on the banks of the Potomac, on that bright April evening, as the sun was declining behind the blue hills of Virginia, in the attitude of combatants, two men, around whom gathered, probably, a more stirring interest than around any other two men in the Union; and yet their political opinions and their personal history were as opposite as their persons, when they stood in their places. They were alike only in chivalry of bearing, integrity and independence of character, genius and pride. They had to all appearance met now to fight to the death with physical weapons,

as they had met so often before, to do battle with the weapons of intellectual warfare. Their opposition had been unceasing. Probably they had never agreed in one prominent public measure, since they were in public life together. Each looked upon the other as, if not the ablest, at least the most annoying and dreaded opponent of his political principles and personal aims. They were, in early life, and to some extent, still, representatives of different phases of society. RANDOLPH, born to affluence; descended from a long and honored line; commanding all that wealth and family influence can give; with the best opportunities for education; accustomed, almost from infancy, to refined and intellectual society; the representative of the free-holders, and inhaling, with the atmosphere around him, the spirit of caste, which, in his circle, curiously intermingled itself, as in the English barons, with a love of freedom; aristocratic in many of his principles, and still more aristocratic in many of his practices; and CLAY, born in obscurity, of humble parentage—the first man of his family known out of his county—‘the mill-boy of the Slashes’—without early opportunities or powerful friends; *rising*, at last, to be a deputy-clerk, and rejoicing in the rise; reading, in the spare hours released from manual toil, the rudiments of the law; going out into the backwoods of Kentucky, to find a ‘location’ among the hunters and pioneers of that then remote territory, with but faint hopes, even in a breast not prone to despondency; seemingly unconscious of the talents and energies he possessed; aspiring to three hundred dollars a year, as the height of his good fortune; taking early a position at an able bar; rising rapidly to the head of it; soon going out into politics; mingling familiarly with the frontier population around him, and identifying himself with their character, habits, pursuits, and feelings; wrestling with the strong, though sometimes rough, champions for the favor of a vigorous, hard-sensed, patriotic and unsophisticated people; winning his way by his talents, and by a boldness as necessary as talents; literally fighting his way up over obstacles of all kinds, and men of all sorts and characters; first, in the State Legislature—then in the United States Senate—in the House—in the Speaker’s chair—and now in the Cabinet; these were the two men, alike in splendid gifts of intellect, yet so unlike in character and circumstance, who now, weapon in hand, stood opposed in mortal combat.”

Clay’s bullet pierced Randolph’s coat. The latter fired into the air. “Mr. Clay, Mr. Clay! you owe me a coat!” screamed the shrill voice of the Virginian. “I am thankful, Mr. Ran-



dolph, that I am no *deeper* in your debt," was the reply of the chivalrous Kentuckian.

Turned out of the Senate by John Tyler, Randolph was returned to the House once more, and on the election of Jackson, in which he concurred, retired from the public councils with a wasted constitution. A member of the Convention of Virginia in 1829, he stood up manfully for the old constitution, and resisted every innovation as a man battling for the graves of his fathers. He, the despiser of office, the reviler of office holders, accepted the mission to Russia, for the first time left the representation of his native State, and utterly unfit to fulfil his duties, braved the chill winds which sweep over the snow-covered north.

Once more at home, he hurled his thunderbolts at the proclamation of Jackson, and spoke from a chair on the hustings in support of State Rights. Having favored Jackson against Adams and Clay—he now said that "Henry Clay alone could save the Union"—the idol of democracy must be shattered by the denounced Federalist.

Clay sacrificed his favored policy for the sake of the Union, and Jackson was saved the necessity of bloodshed and war.

We are drawing rapidly to the close of this strange man's life. "He was," says Mr. Baldwin, "a great man; he had the indispensable elements of greatness—will and constancy. Bruce, Hannibal, and Cæsar, were scarcely his superiors in this respect. No man had more individuality; his moral courage was equal to Luther's. He was loyal to an idea. Like Xavier, with his bell ringing before him as he walked among strange cities, arresting the attention of the startled wayfarers with the message of salvation, and denouncing the coming wrath,—Randolph moved among men the untiring apostle of his creed, ever raising his shrill voice 'against the alarming encroachments of the Federal Government.'"

Randolph, in the opinion of the author, was the wittiest man of his time. His aptness in the choice of words, and the use of quotations was remarkable. He had a facility for seeing remote analogies. His memory was comprehensive, his

information large, his literary taste unsurpassed. He was clear, quick, deep in understanding and thought. His statements saved him many of the processes of ratiocination; much that looked like declamation was only illustration or another form of argument.

As all know, Randolph was unhappy. The tortures of the hypochondriac were his daily experience. His temper and his passions, much the result of his diseased frame, made for him many enemies. About to attempt another visit to Europe, he came into the Senate Chamber, and catching the sound of Clay's voice, entreated to be held up, that he "might hear that voice once more." The two sons of Virginia, enemies in life, exchanged the grasp of friendly parting, as one went down into the dark valley.

"Randolph, in fast declining health, reached Philadelphia, whither he went to take passage from that port. He was too late for the Liverpool packet. He exposed himself to the inclemency of the weather, took cold, which aggravated his disease, and hastened its fatal termination. He was put to bed—his death bed—in his lodgings, at the City Hotel. The idiosyncrasies which had, of late years especially, marked his demeanor, distinguished the last hours of his life. The sudden burst of petulance which disease wrung from him; the affecting kindness and tenderness which disease could not wholly take from him; the rambling conversation in the intervals of acute suffering, in some passages, as brilliant as ever—the last gleams of the sinking lamp; the groanings of remorse, which a review of his past life, at the bar of a stern self-judgment, drew from his contrite heart; the fervid prayer; the hesitating hope: the trust, qualified by self-condemnation, in the Saviour, whose name he professed; the concluding act ere the curtain fell upon the last scene of earth, when, propped up by pillows, he called witnesses to his confirmation of his will, providing for the freedom and support of his slaves, and the last conscious words, which fired his eye and braced his sinking frame, as, speaking in this connection, he laid his skeleton hand strongly upon the shoulder of his faithful servant, John, and said with emphasis—"especially for this man." And then—this last charge upon his conscience off—his mind wandered away to the light, and the scenes, and the friends of the *Early Day*; and, the mutterings of the voice

growing gradually fainter, as he passed on into the thicker shadows of the dark valley, the fluttering pulse stood still, and John Randolph of Roanoke was numbered with the dead! (June 24, 1833, aged sixty.)

They carried him back to his solitary home, and buried him—in death as in life unsocial and isolated—in the forest of Roanoke. In the soil of the Virginia he loved so well, they laid the corse of her faithful and devoted son. They left him to rest, after the long fever of his troubled dream of life was over, in a humble and sequestered grave, beneath two stately pines. There let him sleep on! The gloom of their shade, and the melancholy sighing of the wind through their boughs, are fit emblems of the life which was breathed out in sadness and in sorrow.

The remainder of Mr. Baldwin's book is principally indicated by the chapter headed "Andrew Jackson and Henry Clay." In the later days of American politics, the tall forms of *these* "party leaders" over-top all the men of the times. Whatever the merits of others, around *them* crowd the passions, prejudices and opinions, which are still warm like the glowing embers when the blazing fire goes down. Around *their* standards the talent of the country arrayed itself as a dependant.

Had Henry Clay, in the upward career of his path of fame, never met Andrew Jackson, his statue would have stood among those who have filled the "Consulship," at the earliest age, and with the most enduring renown. These men met, both could not succeed; the pomp and circumstance of military glory gave the palm of success to Jackson, where merit might have decided differently, and at least have halted in her judgment.

Mr. Baldwin speaks of the singular character of our party contests as seen by an European. No social problems to be solved, a well-regulated government settled, and men raving about the division of public lands, the improvement of a harbor, or the regulation of a tariff. He attributes this to the spirit of party, natural to man, and exercised for its own sake. Politics he regards as the American national amusement—the great social safety-valve.

A great deal of this fierce party strife may, we think, be attributed to the fact which we have stated, that these two great men formed parties around themselves, and moulded upon events the impress of their qualities. Each replete with courage, moral and physical, of striking personal appearance, of enthusiastic temperament, of rigorous wills, of great individual pride; they naturally came in conflict, and men, as they ranged themselves under one or the other banner, loved their own leader, and hated the one of the opposite party.

The bitterest invective, the most violent personal assaults, the most intense excitement, marked these political struggles, as the result of the *personal* character of the *parties* engaged. Both their partisans were rather the believers in two different creeds, promulgated by two great prophets, who led them, than the leaders of the opposing hosts. Merely the ablest among men, originally holding common views, and banding for a common end.

The character of these "party leaders" will afford, as time advances, matter of increasing interest for the biographer. Party feeling is still somewhat in the way of a fair discussion of their merits, though Mr. Baldwin seems to have been as successful as could be expected from any one *now*, in giving to the world an impartial estimate. "That they were great men—especially in that sense which defines greatness to be the power to control men, and mould opinion or action—will," he thinks, "not be denied." They stood as antagonists, and yet, as they stood, the points of resemblance were obvious.

Their education in revolutionary times; their common adoption of a new State in early youth, with but little aid except their self-trained powers; their indomitable wills; their defiance of opposition; their judgment, common sense, and tact; their strong passions; their social qualities, and their imperial, lofty spirit—are all alluded to as furnishing the features of resemblance in the portraiture of both. Says the author:—"They were Americans both, loving their whole country, its honor, its glory, its institutions, its Union, with a love kindled early and quenched only in

death." Clay, he thinks, could have been a soldier as well as an orator and a statesman.

"Jackson's spirit, if not more active, was less fitted for the council-hall than the battle-field. His was not the elaborate eloquence of the senate. Swords, not words, were *his* arguments. His was the true Demosthenic eloquence of action. He had neither the temper nor the abilities to parley. He could speak tersely, vigorously, movingly, but his words were the brief words of command. Action followed speech, as thunder the lightning. He had no patience for the solemn forms, the dull routine, the prosy speech-making, the timid platitudes, or the elaborate ratiocinations of legislative debate. Sudden and quick in opinion as in quarrel, heart, soul and mind all mingled in his conclusions, and the energy that conceived a purpose, started it into overt act. With him, to think and to do were not so much two things as one. His eager and impatient soul would have fevered over a debate on a proposition to declare war, or to provide means for prosecuting it, as the knight, Ivanhoe, on his sick bed in the castle of Front de Boeuf, writhed in helpless impatience, when he heard the clangor of the warriors storming the battlements for his deliverance."

Jackson is represented as a man of great qualities. "He was much misunderstood," says the author. "He was neither god nor devil." He was kind in his social relations, simple and honest in his personal habits; he loved his country fervently. His will was the ultimate director of his action. It moved him often to what was good; but, whether for good or evil, he suffered nothing to oppose that will. In every measure we are inclined to consider his ultimate object somewhat mixed with personal prejudice, or with his idea of the good of his country. But the country must be benefited *his* way, and in the way he chose to confer the benefit; and thus his *will* often prevented his reasoning faculties from casting the light of reflection on his actions.

Of all the men of the republic, Jackson has most impressed himself upon its destiny. To him we owe the position of the President as the leader of a dominant party—the immediate, active, powerful representative of the people. Whether for



good or evil; we have now realized the idea of a strong executive,—a strength for which Hamilton labored in vain in the constitutional convention. If time permitted, we might show, we think, that his expectations of the results of restricted power have proved well-grounded. “As the nation grows,” he said, “certain powers must be possessed; and if you do not give them, they will be usurped.”

To Jackson we owe the power of patronage. Binding parties together, and throwing the selfish principle in all its potency as the powerful agent in party contests. This, more than any thing else, has accomplished that subordination of the State Governments which was the dread of Randolph's life. The Central Government has its disciplined officers in all the States, bound to the presidential head by the ever-vibrating chord of self-interest. The subordinate offices, disposed of at Washington, surpass in honor and emolument the highest gifts of a State. Every thing turns on national politics. Questions of State interest enter little even into State elections; and a member of the legislature is chiefly valued as his vote may affect a seat in the United States Senate. Every thing, from governor to constable, is absorbed in the whirlpool of national agitation.

We pass over the author's account of the struggles during the administration of Jackson and John Quincy Adams. The fierce assaults of party invective, the great commercial distress, the bank, the specie circular and the veto. Jackson left his successor to weather the storm which *he* had raised, and the bark that bore the political fortunes of Martin Van Buren went down in the tempest.

Our author now turns to Clay, the survivor of the great triumvirate. We have discussed his character in treating of Randolph and Jackson, and there remains but little more to add. He was now ripening in years like a sheaf of well filled grain, and the last greatest era of his life came on.

All are familiar with his stand on the Compromise of 1850, the wonderful exertions of an old man in its behalf; his astonishing labors on the floor of the Senate. Our author remarks:

"Never before had he fully shown himself the man God had made him. For fifty years, he had never found a rival for a whole session, as an orator and leader in a deliberative assembly; but men had compared him to himself, and had noted how far he was, in this speech or that from his high-water mark of excellence. Now he was above himself—above where the flood of his sweeping and surge-like eloquence had ever gone before. As a mere orator, he left the great deeds of his youth and middle age behind. But his oratory was the least remarkable of his claims to attention and gratitude. He was eloquent in every thing—instinct with eloquence, as if possessed by its spirit—in movement—in manner—in writing—in speech—in tone—above all, perhaps, in social intercourse transfusing himself into others; now in the closet, now at the mess table, now in the committee room, in the drive, on the street, every where—in every way—seeking no repose—wanting none—it was the fever and fanaticism of soul that carried him with but one object before him—and yet that fever and fanaticism presided over by a judgment and a tact that never forsook and never misled him.

"He could retire now. Why linger 'superfluous on the stage?' His sun trembling on the verge of the horizon, like a tropical sun, gorgeous, yet with a solemn and sacred aspect, magnified even beyond his size at noon, might now go down without a cloud or shadow, lighting up all the sky around with rays of marvelous glory long after he had set!"

As another specimen of Mr. Baldwin's excellent work, we give his estimate of the character of Clay.

"Great injustice has been done Mr. Clay, by instituting comparisons between a single faculty or a few faculties of his intellect, and a single or a few faculties of his illustrious contemporaries; and by a general deduction of his inferiority to them, drawn from this comparison. It might be safely admitted that Clay did not possess the wonderful analysis of Calhoun—that incarnation of logic. It might, also, be conceded, that he had no claim to the Miltonic grandeur of imagination, the classic erudition, the artistic skill in words, and the comprehensive and lucid statement of Webster. Not only Clay's intellect, but his whole organization depends for its just appreciation upon a view of it *as a whole*. It is remarkable for the harmonious proportions, and the large though equable, developments of all the parts. If, by no one faculty, standing alone, would he have been greatly distinguished, yet in no

one faculty was. he less than remarkable; while *the whole* made up a complement of distinction and power denied, as we think, to any other man of his time. Reflect, how rare it is to find concentrated in one man all the qualities of mind, of body, of temperament, which make a successful manager in war-times, and in those crises of affairs in peace, requiring the highest faculties of the captain. Reflect, how few of his contemporaries could, on any one prominent occasion, have supplied his place. Consider, how few men have the qualities which preserve the confidence of a party for years—how few could have held the undisputed leadership of a furious opposition for nearly a generation. Who else has ever done it? Consider, that with these qualities were blended a business capacity and knowledge of detail which qualified him for success in every department of practical affairs. Consider, that he showed a genius for diplomacy inferior to that of no man of the age; for his settlement of the sectional questions when they seemed impossible of adjustment, called for as high diplomatic ability as the treaties he negotiated. Consider that, as a jurist, notwithstanding the small attention he paid to the practice and study of law, he rose to the first rank at the eminent bar of his own State; and that, as an advocate, he had no peer in courts, where the most brilliant and eloquent orators of the country pleaded. Consider, too, that he led the policy of the country in every great measure from Madison, indeed, from the last Congress of Jefferson's administration, until he met the man of his destiny in Andrew Jackson; that in Democratic Congresses he carried almost every one of his leading measures, and was only defeated by the vetoes of the President from fixing upon the country almost the whole line of his policy—a policy so broad as to have embraced nearly the whole scheme of Federal administration. If we look at his measures, we find schemes so large—systems so broad—as to belong only to minds the most capacious; and, besides them, we see faculties of administration so extended as to embrace the fullest details of the bureau or the farm. No man ever had a busier invention in moulding measures, or a more active enterprise in prosecuting his purposes. And, when we add that, for thirty years, a greater body of intellect looked up to him in reverence or followed him with unhesitating confidence, than any man of his age attracted; that those who knew him longest were those who appreciated him the most highly; that senators and judges applauded him as loudly as the village zealots of his party at

the clubs; and that generation after generation of statesmen found him and left him at the post of unquestioned national leadership—at the first post of effective influence on all questions, which, for the time, sank the clamors, and disbanded the organization of party; we begin to realize the error, which would degrade the intellect of such a man, from the highest class of the gifted sons of genius God has ever given to the earth. In the multiplicity of his accomplishments, in the versatility of his powers, in the grandeur of his schemes, in the strength of his intellect, in the loftiness and range of his ambition, in his sway over the intelligence of his country, and in the monumental measures of his policy, Alexander Hamilton, alone of his countrymen, approaches him.”

We have further in this volume a contrast of Webster and Clay, the latter being awarded the superiority. Webster’s speeches may outlive those of Clay. But the acts and measures of Clay are his lasting monument. “We think,” says the author, “the judgment of posterity will be in favor of the intellect possessing the faculty of constructing great measures and schemes of statesmanship, and of those great executive energies which carried them into execution.”

With this we heartily concur. The question was decided in the Compromise debate in the Senate. Clay conceived. Webster powerfully assisted in performing. Clay *made* and *started* a ball. Webster impelled it with Herculean power.

These great men have all gone. The first, unloved by the mass, died in solitude: but around his grave crowd thickly the sympathies which the sorrows of a great and passionate heart call out from the breast of the reflecting lover of his kind. We have dwelt with a species of fascination on this interesting sketch of his mournful life.

Over the lives of Jackson and Clay, two great parties stood mourners, and the sad wail of a nation was their fittest requiem. Over the last departed, men wept as if a dear friend had died. He was their idol, their political embodiment, and as the standard dropped from his nerveless grasp, the Whig party was no more.



ART. VIII.—CONSIDERATIONS ON SOME RECENT SOCIAL THEORIES.  
Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1853.

THE importance of the subjects discussed in this little volume, is the reason of our offering a few remarks and suggestions which have spontaneously grown out of its perusal. Our times are stirring; they portend events of great importance and fearful magnitude; no subject, how sacred soever its nature may be, is too holy for the most searching investigation: and the minds of men are now prying into the subject-matter of human rights, with a zeal and a boldness, such as have never before characterized the inquiries of the human mind. This has led many, who are fearful of the stability of the existing state of things, to be afraid of the boldness of thought; and they would, if they dared to do so, arrest all investigation, unless it brought about results which met their approbation. But this cannot now, and we trust never will be the fate which is to come upon those bold minds which are so daring as to probe into the mysteries of all subjects of human investigation. He who fears the light will always avoid its brightness, lest he may not be able to withstand the disclosures and discoveries it may enable him to make.

The author of this little book has shown that he does not fear to discuss the most difficult and abstruse subjects that now engage the most powerful minds; and that he does not yield his assent to theories which, in his judgment, are not sustained by correct principles and sound reasoning. In the mode of treating the various subjects discussed by him, he exhibits a manly independence; and with most of his conclusions, the strict conservative would generally agree; yet he does not believe that mankind have arrived at a goal beyond which it is impossible for them to go. In this we heartily concur with the author; for we have always insisted that man was a being of progress—that society was progressive—and that these truths are caused by the improvement



of man, not only in the arts and sciences, but in those humane principles now embodied in the moral code of nations, by which their affairs, as nations, are regulated and adjusted.

It is not our design to write a review of the book at the head of this article, but we shall make it the text for some thoughts which have been suggested by its perusal; and we shall freely use the language of the author, in quotations from his valuable treatise. To enable the reader to comprehend the drift of our remarks, we here give the table of contents:—"1. The People; 2. Liberty; 3. The Universal Republic; 4. Socialism; 5. Co-operative Associations; 6. The Future."

In the first chapter are discussed the various views that are now entertained by the popular leaders in Europe, such as Kossuth, Mazzini, Louis Blanc and others. The general idea embraced by these men is, that the people, irrespective of, and without the control of constitutions, are not only the source of all power, but have the right to do as they please; and they seem to think that such a state of things would effect that amongst the people which they so ardently desire—Liberty. They do not know, or they pretend not to know, that that people only are free, who can, and do place restraints upon themselves. Licentiousness is not liberty; for it will always generate anarchy and disorder. Ignorance is the parent of despotism—it has been so—and it will always be so.

We commend to attention the conclusion of the first chapter, as containing sentiments to which we give our concurrence and sanction:

"It is the will of God—a will we may not understand nor question—that progress should be very gradual; not visible from year to year, and only with difficulty to be seen from century to century. But this is no reason for discouragement. In all ages, there have been martyrs, who have died for the sake of the people, and who, in death have trusted that their labor would be blessed, though they could not gain the assurance while they lived. And their work was not performed, nor their blood offered in vain, for their example

has given animation to a constant line of followers. The cause of the people always claims undiminished effort. It appeals to the conscience of every man to do the work which has been entrusted to him. The people in many places are misled, troubled and exasperated. They are seeking for help. It is for us to help them, that they may help themselves. We cannot keep things as they are. The world may be regenerated by us not less than by others. In our impatience we may long for more rapid and wider results, than with our best efforts we can reach; but even our faintest exertion will count in this work of ages. We can do something at least for human suffering; and though successive centuries may pass away before the people shall be enlightened, and free and happy; yet we shall have helped the coming of that time, and God will remember though man forget."—Pages 20, 22.

This extract will give a good idea of the style of the author, and show that he is not one of those reformers who expect that as soon as a proposition for the removal of wrong is presented, it must be acted on, even though it might be productive of more evil than good, because of the haste with which the same might be carried out. All those reforms which have caused the mightiest revolutions, in enlightened nations, have been long in maturing. Gradually has one principle after another been elicited, by some daring and bold thinker—this has slowly settled down in the mass of thought—presently another was educed, and after startling the leaden repose of the human mind, it assumed its place in the rank of great principles, until there was produced such an accumulation of moral power, that nothing was needed but some master mind to take his stand upon that mass of principle and thought, and by the enunciation of some great truth, startle the world. When that truth was uttered, the combined powers of error and bigotry could not strangle it; because it was approved and sanctioned by those who had toiled and struggled through midnight darkness to reach the light of day.

Our author says, "that speaking of liberty in its social and political relation, there is meant *that state in which a man*

*is not deprived of the power of doing what is best for himself or others by the interference of another.*"—Page 30. The italics are the author's. He does not directly, in terms, controvert the position, so false in many political theories, that when men enter into a state of society, they yield a portion of their natural liberty to preserve the remainder; but his whole reasoning is based on the position that man has never been found in any other state than that of society, and that rights only spring up and are found to exist in a state of society. So soon as men meet together, a relation between them subsists, and from that very relation there must, of necessity, arise rights. If men were in a state of isolation, there could not be any rights; but if such a state, as that just supposed, could be conceived of, we are utterly at a loss to understand how rights could exist. A right presupposes that its existence is acknowledged—that acknowledgment could only be made by one who assented to it—as soon as this should be done, it seems to us that a state of society would necessarily exist.

Let us now look into the question of Liberty, and we shall perceive that almost as many different theories have prevailed as there are writers who have investigated the subject,—we mean that liberty which exists in civil society. By examining some recent treatises, we find that Mr. Warner, in his "Liberties of America," defines Liberty to be "*the power of doing, free from human hindrance, whatever God's laws permit.*" (Page 18.) We cannot adopt this definition of liberty, if it is to be applied to human government; for we conceive that, wherever a government is established, it is done by human agency, and this very agency must impose restrictions upon, and reservations of, power. And we are of opinion, from a tolerably careful perusal of this book, that such is the application the author intends to make of the principles set forth in his work. It is a treatise that deserves to be studied and thoroughly examined. Hence, in the discussion of this important topic, the work has been introduced in connection with the "Considerations on some recent Social Theories."

It contains much error, mixed with important and valuable truths.

In an elaborate and still later work, "On Civil Liberty and Self-Government," by Dr. Lakin, of the South Carolina College, we have a definition of civil liberty which coincides with our own views much more nearly than the definitions in either of the other works we have mentioned. The definition is found in the first volume, page 34:—"I mean by civil liberty, that liberty which plainly results from the application of the general idea of freedom to the civil state of man,—that is, to his relations as a political being—a being obliged by his nature, and destined by his Creator, to live in society. Civil liberty is the result of man's two-fold character, as an individual and social being, so soon as both are respected." The very idea of civil liberty which this author enforces in his volumes, with great variety of learning and vast research, is founded on the principle that it can only exist when men come in contact in a state of society; and that it has its origin in the restraints that men voluntarily impose upon themselves. The noblest freedom to which individual man can aspire, is that of being able to control himself, to govern his appetites and passions, and thus present to others an example of self-rule. That this is true, as regards individuals, is verified by the veneration in which every virtuous and good man is held by the generations of after times, and is sanctioned by the universal fact, that only such as have put restraint upon themselves are regarded as virtuous and good.

The same principles that apply to individuals, as above set forth, we insist, are equally applicable to men in a state of society. No people have ever been free unless they imposed restraints upon themselves, and declared that those certain things they would not do. The history of every nation teaches the startling truth—(it ought to be startling, inasmuch as it has ever proved to be true, and yet has been so little regarded)—that no people can be free who indulge themselves in those actions so generally calculated to dazzle

by means of the power which is displayed. Instead of diffusing the benefits which flow from a mild and forbearing exercise of power, nations are too often led astray in the pursuit of what has too long been called the glory of a nation. Such works as the three we have mentioned, are adapted to bring about a desirable state of things. They will lead to reflection, and by this means will produce beneficial results. Let it not be supposed, however, that we agree in every respect with all the authors whose views are presented on the subject of Liberty. Warner's book is by far the most objectionable to us; Dr. Luben's volumes accord, in the main, with our own views; and before we conclude, we shall point out in the work under review what, in our opinion, is a gross error. It is remarkable, however, that in the same year three works of the character these are should be put forth from the press of our country. In this connection, we will not omit the "Tract on Government," by Mr. Walker, of Charleston, which deserves the high praise bestowed upon it by competent judges of its merits. It is a valuable contribution to political philosophy.

Our author will be permitted to speak again for himself on liberty, page 38:—

"It will only be when nations learn that liberty depends, not on forms, but on the personal character of the individuals who compose them; that it rests on the virtue, the power of self-government of each one of the people; that the disadvantages of physical condition must be overcome by continual effort, and not by any sudden impulse or impetuous and quickly exhausted burst; and that freedom is only to be preserved by moral excellence;—it is then alone that they will possess liberty, for then they will have learned that where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty."

This is a noble sentence, and contains sentiments that ought to be engraved on the hearts of the people of this country; for it is true now, it has ever been, and ever will be true—that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people."



In the third chapter our author treats of "The Universal Republic." No man of philosophic turn of mind can survey society, and not perceive that many evils exist. This knowledge brings about efforts and attempts to procure relief. Commendable as these efforts are, they frequently fail of the accomplishment of the design contemplated, because they are misdirected, and too often proceed upon ignorance of the proper means to secure the end. Sometimes the result follows, because the evils to be corrected are not properly understood. In the opinions of theorists, especially of those who are visionary, it often happens that they suppose the political evils of which complaint is made, could be effectually cured by the adoption of a republican form of government. They appear never to have thought that when political power is placed in the hands of the ignorant and unenlightened, who do not, and from their ignorance are utterly unable to appreciate the importance of the power they wield, the most dangerous weapons to the prosperity and existence of society are put under their control. It is always dangerous to trust ignorance, and if this position be correct, it will ever be true that no people can or will enjoy the privileges of a republican government, unless they be sufficiently enlightened to put restraints upon themselves. The most dangerous tyrant that can sway the masses of mankind is ignorance; for it is suspicious of those who have the honesty and manliness to declare the truth, and is easily duped by the cunning and designing, who, to ingratiate themselves into popular favor, will ever pretend to be the friends of the people. In all discussions in relation to government, it should ever be remembered that a monarchy may be best for one people, and that a republic may be best for another; this depends upon the capacity and ability of the people to form a proper estimate of the form of government. We have no doubt that the people in every country have over them just that government which is best adapted to their condition: we believe that no government can exist which the people do not uphold. How long could the despotism of Russia exist, if the people should

determine that it should no longer continue? The breath of the people would destroy it, as it has made it. Can a government be pointed out, as now existing, or that has ever existed, which did not depend for that existence upon the will of the people? The people are sovereign every where, and impart strength, and power, and stability to every government that has ever played a part in the affairs of earth. The grand distinctive characteristic which distinguishes one people from another in the form of governments under which they respectively live, is the amount of knowledge and intelligence they have. Where ignorance prevails amongst the mass of the people, there monarchy obtains a foothold and exercises its power. Where intelligence is the characteristic of the people, there will be a large share of civil liberty, be the form of government what it may. Hence we adopt the conclusions of our author on page 48.

“The conclusions, then, upon which we must rest, are, that no form of government possesses any inherent virtue; that liberty may be developed under one, as under another; that that government is to be preferred which best secures to its subjects the means of progress in liberty; that these means may be secured under any form, but would be, for the most part, absent from a universal republic.”

The fourth chapter is devoted to the different theories of Socialism which prevail amongst the pretended reformers of the day. One of the principal features of these theories is the doctrine of equality in every thing. These reformers, in the pursuit of an abstract proposition, forget that, unless all men can be made equal in every respect, physically and mentally, all their efforts to attain that equality for which they are seeking, must be fruitless. Such a dogma, however, is founded upon a false assumption—one that is not true, and never can be. All experience is against it. He who would be successful in the attempts to reform men, must introduce a principle which can be more easily reduced to practice, than the phantom of equality, which dwells only in the heated imaginations of wild reformers. But when all these theories

of reform are analyzed, it will be ascertained that they are based upon the assumption that if there were an equal distribution of property, all the social evils which disfigure society would be removed. This is a gross error; for, until men can be so enlightened and improved as to be constitutionally different from what they are, such a state of things can never exist. We do not doubt that wrongs do exist, and that they can be rectified. This will, however, only be done when evils which grow out of the institutions of society shall be corrected by instrumentalities which society will apply for the correction. Our author here shall speak for himself:

“The inequality in the distribution of property arises from two sets of causes: the one, the natural created differences in human character, and the variety of God’s dispensations to man; the other, the injustice of human institutions of past and present times, by which some men have been favored to the disadvantage of others. It is plain that the first of these causes is unalterable by any human arrangements. It is only the second class which can be changed by them. But this obvious distinction has been overlooked by the popular modern theorists. It has been their great and fatal error to propose by their systems to alter the action of God’s laws, and to change the operations of Divine Wisdom. They have attempted to destroy, by artificial organization, the indestructible and unchangeable elements of human nature. Their efforts might well have been directed to do away with the wrongs which blot the earth; for all wrong is to be done away by human efforts. But they have dashed against the wall of God’s providence, and their fancies have shivered into atoms at the base.”—Pages 60, 61.

The foregoing considerations we heartily commend to the attention and reflection of all reformers of social and political evils; and we do not suppose that it would be arrogating any thing beyond the legitimate sphere of a review of the book under consideration, to say that considerations should be seriously pondered by religious reformers. We believe that the political structure of governments very fairly indicates the religious feelings of the people; and we believe that

this view could be satisfactorily sustained by the examination of the forms of government and of religions which prevailed, and do now prevail, amongst the different nations of the earth.

"Co-operative Associations" next engage our author's attention; and here we say that, as the subject, in our opinion, is more properly connected with political economy, we shall dismiss that portion of the volume, commending its careful perusal to those who desire to become acquainted on this subject, with the views of a clear writer, who does not fear to express his opinions.

The last chapter, "The Future," is full of interest. It opens to view a wide field of speculation in morals, politics, and governmental improvement; but it is true that unless men improve upon the past, and become wiser and better, all the theories that may be found in the teeming brain, and recommended for the progress and improvement of man in politics and morals, will not avail any thing. The advancement of the race depends upon their profiting by the lessons of experience taught them by the sad reverses which have always attended the neglect of the principles of virtue; for these principles alone can secure permanent public prosperity. Every nation, which has been influenced by the grand principle of the mutual reciprocation of good, in its political measures, and has not been governed by a narrow and selfish policy, has been prosperous as long as that course of policy has been followed; but as soon as those principles were abandoned, its downfall hastened. This is a law which is as true and invariable in its results as any principle in morals. Its violation brings with it those consequences that always, and surely follow in its train, and they result with as much certainty as the needle points to the pole. A nation violates its faith, pledged to another in a treaty; and though that nation, to whom those obligations are to be rendered and performed, may not have the power to compel their performance; and its rights may thus, in the wanton exercise of power, be recklessly trampled on; yet there is a moral senti-

ment, thus disrégarded and set at naught, which will set itself up, and in the face of all the earth, vindicate that which is right, and punish the wrong. What would be the consequence to the nation that would thus disregard its plighted faith? The example would inculcate upon its people that worst of all political curses—bad faith. If the government disregard its pledges, what will bind the people to obedience? No power but that which will show that Omnipotence rules in the affairs of nations, will be sufficient to do it. From these considerations, important instruction may be derived, teaching every people that, if they desire to be prosperous and happy, their governors and rulers must be virtuous and upright men, who, instead of promoting their personal aggrandizement, will direct all their efforts to the advancement of such measures as will secure to the people the greatest possible amount of good in accordance with their condition. The wiser and more virtuous a people are, the greater will be the benefits and blessings which can be conferred upon them. A virtuous and enlightened people are always better prepared, by the training through which they have passed, to appreciate the blessings of a good government. Such are some of the principles that must obtrude themselves upon “the powers that be,” in the various political arrangements which will be made by the governments of the earth, to meet the demands of the people.

Before we close the remarks which have been suggested by the perusal of this excellent little volume, we must notice that he cannot permit the domestic institutions of the South to pass by without the expression of his regret; that even here that necessary evil is in existence, though he acquits us of all blame in the introduction of the institution on the continent. This is that portion of the author's volume to which we record our dissent. It is not now that we can take the time and labor to express our views fully on this most interesting and perplexing subject; interesting, because the prosperity and civilization, and, we believe, the Christianity of the world, now, and for a long period to come, depend



upon its existence and continuance; and perplexing, because the power and influence of the enlightened world are arrayed against the institution. Considerations of the vastest magnitude crowd upon the mind, in the contemplation of the subject. Let one suffice. Look at the enterprise and industry of Europe. See England, with all her manufactures of iron, and cotton, and woolen goods, and the extensive combinations of men, art and science, to bring out the labor and the wealth of that fast-anchored isle—then ask the question—what is it that puts in motion and activity all that labor and industry? What is it that employs those thousands of operatives who are constantly engaged in attending the steam driven spindle and loom? What is it that imparts power to those furnaces, sending up their never-ceasing smoke, which are driving machinery to manufacture those goods that supply the markets of the world? The answer, and the only answer that can be given, is—*cotton, the product of slave-labor*. If this article of commerce were not produced for one year only, in the Southern section of the United States, where alone it can be successfully cultivated, Europe would feel a shock, such as Attila, beneath whose horse's feet the grass never grew, never caused, though he was called "the scourge of God." England would be a sea of blood. Could any of the European governments stand, when the people would be thrown out of employment, and, in consequence thereof, be in want of bread? A frantic people, pinched by want, and starving for the want of the necessities of life, would know no law; and thrones and hierarchies would be blasted with a breath. This subject has long engaged our attention, and we intend, at no distant day, if our life and health continue, to give to the world, through this Review, our views on the topics above indicated. Some of the views which we entertain may be regarded as visionary; but we believe, no matter what they are, that truth will never suffer in any contest where, in an open field, she grapples with error.

We indulge the hope that, as the principles of Christianity are felt by mankind, and become part and parcel of the

governing laws of nations, governments will be softened in many of their harsh features, and that so far as they can, without interfering with the duties of individuals to themselves and to each other, they will set on foot such plans of amelioration for the existing evils as will produce lasting good. Principles which would bind men together as brethren—and such are the fundamental doctrines of Christianity—will lead nations out of difficulties that now environ them, and from which there scarce seems to be any way of escape. Nations can be led by a way they know not. Our own country is an example of this truth; but fearful is the responsibility under which we are placed. Our government extends over a territory which now stretches from the Atlantic to the Pacific, thus enabling our people to ride on two oceans, and placing us in proximity with both Europe and Asia. The fabled visions of Eastern gorgeousness are bursting upon our vision; and all that we have to do is to reach forth and grasp the golden prize. Asiatic-dullness and fixedness are brought into contact with American enterprise and activity; and the leaden repose which has for ages weighed down Asia's intellect will be broken, and new life will be imparted to her teeming millions. The vivifying powers of Christianity will make the dead to live; and a moral, social, and religious revolution, that will astound the world, will be the grand result. Causes are at work that will bring about great good; and we fondly cherish the hope that our country is to be a prominent agent in this mighty work of accomplishing so much good; but, to occupy a position so exalted, she must be true to the spirit and design of her government, and must always remember that virtue is to be her polar star.

Our author concludes his admirable work as follows:—

“It may be the will of God that our own country should give another example of the insufficiency of material prosperity to preserve a people from decline. But such a result would be a warning more terrible than any which has been known before. The faults, the weaknesses, the faithlessness

of men will have ruined the most splendid undertaking and the fairest prospect ever open to any people. The hope of the world will be broken, the faith of men in themselves and in each other will be shaken, and the progress of mankind indefinitely delayed.

"Such must be our fate, unless we feel that our responsibilities are equal to our privileges, and that our only safety is in endeavoring, with constant effort, to fulfil them. Taking no low standard of duty, satisfied with no partial performance, no incomplete attainment, dazzled by no show of awkward success, deluded by no selfish plans, turned aside by no popular enthusiasm, yielding to no fatigue or indifference,—it is for each one of us to do his best, feeling that not only his own happiness, but that the fortunes of his country depend upon his deeds. The trust committed to the hands of the industrious and the prosperous classes here is the future of their country. It is further to provide against the evils which threaten it, by spreading and improving education; by laboring to throw open freely every opportunity for advantages that may be shared by all; by checking every injustice and every corruption; and, above all—including all—by endeavoring to carry into daily life and into common actions, the spirit of Christianity.

"If this be the spirit of our people, the liberty which we now enjoy will continue and increase; the republic will be the firmest as well as the best of governments. There will be no need of theories of social regeneration; for the principles of Christianity are the principles of social justice, of equality such as is possible before God, and of a true fraternity among men."—Pages 157, 158.

Such is the conclusion of a small volume, which contains much matter for solid, serious reflection, and which commends itself to the calm attention of all those who would make any efforts for the promotion of correct principles, of morals, and of governments among men. The influence which men and nations exert upon each other is reciprocal, and they are respectively responsible for the good or evil of that influence. Hence, it is important that great care should be manifested in the adoption of principles by which men and nations are to be governed in their intercourse with each other. We know of no political morality which is different from that morality which is exhibited by individuals, only

that the former is applicable to nations, and the latter to the members of communities. Nations are made up of individuals. If the individuals be virtuous,—if they shape their conduct by principles that are founded on true morality, then it will be true also of the nation, that those principles which prevail in common life, will be exhibited in that code of principles which govern the nation. If virtue and justice are the characteristics of the people, they will be shown to the world in the government; for one of the strongest proofs of the virtue and justice of a people, will be the observance of these in the affairs and dealings of the government. The criterion of a people is to be found in the characteristics and principles embodied in the government under which they live. Public opinion is always formed upon what is to be seen in the rulers and governors of a people, which is the best exponent of that public justice by which the world is governed. Let us not treat public opinion with contempt, for it is the most powerful agent which is now controlling the destinies of man;—if it be erroneous, let us endeavor to correct it; but if it be right, all opposition to it will be fruitless. We must examine closely, form our conclusions deliberately upon mature reflection, and then act with promptness and decision. This is absolutely necessary in this day, when every theory and every proposition is examined with the acutest intelligence, and most probing scrutiny. Nothing is received upon trust—every thing must undergo the searching ordeal. In this stern conflict of opinions, Truth has nothing to fear; she may receive harsh wounds in the contest, but she will, in the end, prevail, and obtain a glorious victory.

## ART. IX.—CRITICAL NOTICES.

*Political Experience of the Ancients, in its bearing on Modern Times.* By HUGH SEYMOUR TREMENHERE. London: John Murray, 1852.—This is a valuable little volume, and should, by all means, be republished in America, if not done so already. It contains an excellent analysis of Aristotle's Treatise on Government, besides extracts from Polybius on the Roman Constitution, and also from Cicero's Treatise on a Republic or Commonwealth. The great value of the work is the correct and wholesome opinions which it expresses on political subjects. While the true principles of liberty are maintained, all tendency to excessive democracy and demagoguism is discountenanced in this book. It is very remarkable, after the lapse of so many ages, and of our boasted progress, how little political can be pointed out which escaped the attention of that most remarkable man, Aristotle. His ideas of political society, of franchise, of different forms of government, of progressive changes, of revolutions, of true liberty, of public happiness, national character and education, afford invaluable lessons to the present day. Mr. Tremenhere says, "he considered political society a greater and loftier thing than an individual, and prior even in the intention of nature; for nature (or the god of nature) intended not man's existence alone, but the perfecting of his moral and intellectual being, which is impossible except under the protection of political society. For that reason the law, and not individuals, shall be the ruling power. He who submits to law, submits to what has about it something of divine, but he who submits to the unlimited authority of man, submits to what may have all the passions of a wild beast." Aristotle proceeds, however, to show that a political system of absolute and universal equality is bad, and that most democratic revolutions, or revolutions in democracies, proceed from the exaggeration of the principle of equality. Equality allowed where there existed great differences of race and dissimilarity of character, he thought, would be unfavorable to tranquillity, and that no well ordered State could be formed out of such an agglomeration of discordant materials placed on an equal footing. That, therefore, citizenship was not a universal right, but a privilege conferred in a legal manner by the act of the State, on such as were thought fit to be allowed to participate in the governing power, either by themselves or their representatives; and the question always recurs,



how did the original possessor obtain it? Aristotle contends, throughout his whole work, that the question of admission was to be determined by the circumstances of each community; and that the right does not flow from any abstract rights in individuals, but from a just and enlightened sense of expediency in each particular case, having in view the safety of the State and the best interest of the community. Aristotle warns us against demagogues, generally the cause of the ruin of democracies. They will flatter and mislead the multitude. They are always for giving them that power which they intend to exercise themselves. The most dangerous passion of a democracy is the passion for change; and Cicero used to bid his countrymen pray, not that the gods would add blessings upon their country, but that they would preserve those they already had.

Some short notice is also given by our author, of Macchiavelli, Bodin, Bellenden, Harrington, Sidney and Loch. He exposes some of Mr. Loch's fallacies, as, that a political society can only operate by the act of the majority, and that the whole body of the people were entitled to the possession of power, meaning all men, without regard to qualification or character. Algernon Sidney also recognizes the principle that all franchises are conferred by government on society as privileges, and not as rights. Aristotle, when he says that the law is an agreement or pledge between the citizens to do justice to each other, never dreamt of adopting Hobbes' theory of a social compact, which is contrary to the principles upon which he bases government, and the rights and duties under government. The necessities, safety and welfare of society are the grounds upon which he has placed the authority of government, and there they should rest, and on this necessity, and for its safety and welfare, the South intends to maintain her system, notwithstanding the theories of Mr. Richard Hildreth and his British co-laborers in the cause of that equality which they deny and refuse in their own case, but so lustily urge upon us. "The metaphysical theory of the natural equality of men," Mr. Hildreth may practice in New England, (see his *Theory of Politics*, 198, 205;) but we repel it at the South, though we should thereby draw down upon us, from that great New Englander, the ridiculous charges that we planters condemn and despise even agricultural industry, and that our institutions inculcate the well known Yankee propensities of plunder, and domineering insolence and cruelty of the ancients, without their taste, eloquence, or warlike renown. Let our men be compared with those of New England, in society; in the

camp; at the bar; in the halls of legislation, from the year 1776 to 1854, and we shall feel no cause to blush. *Honi soit qui mal y pense.*

*Maxims of Washington.* Collected and arranged by JOHN FREDERICK SCHROEDER. D. Appleton & Company, New York.—This is a well digested compilation of the political, social, moral and religious apophthems of the purest man of his own or of any other age. It consists of extracts taken from the speeches, public papers and private letters of Washington, and embraces as wide, if not a more extended range of subject than any other work of the description ever before published. Several of the quotations contained in Mr. Schroeder's book are trite, but none the less estimable, because they are familiar, and many excellent passages are given with which the admirers of their great author have probably never met. Besides amply repaying an attentive perusal, this volume is well calculated to become a *vade mecum* in the hands of not only American citizens, but all who reverence the profound wisdom and rare virtues of the Father of his country—the apostle of Liberty throughout the world. The subjects have been carefully arranged by the collator, each under its appropriate heading, and the whole is prefixed by an excellent index, pointing immediately to the passage sought. Altogether, the book evinces great care in its preparation, and will be apt to satisfy a want long existing in the walks of sterling American literature.

*Chemical Atlas, or The Chemistry of Familiar Objects.* By EDWARD L. YOUNG. New York, 1855: D. Appleton & Co.—Mr. Young has been, previously to the publication of his present work, familiarly known to the scientific world in connection with chemical researches. This book is an extension of the author's Chemical Chart which was published some years ago, and met with very great success. The "Atlas" now issued is extended to a larger variety of subjects, and is more systematic in its arrangements; but instead of superseding the former work, it is eminently calculated to become a companion to it. The "Atlas" contains a large number of colored illustrations, together with explanatory observations, simply, yet vigorously written. Teachers will find the "Atlas" an invaluable accessory in their course of instruction—one quite equal in its uses to a set of chemical apparatus. The typography of the volume is both elegant and appropriate.

*Primary Geography.* By S. S. CORNELL. New York, 1855: D. Appleton & Co.—This is the initiatory volume of a new series of Geog-

raphies in which it is intended to make many and valuable improvements in the appliances of a very important branch of education. By all the old systems, the student has been obliged to wade through a mass of verbiage expressed in terms mostly unfitted for the comprehension of children, and therefore incapable of lasting benefit. In the series it is proposed to make the progress gradual and the impression distinct by assisting the memory and aiding the understanding by means of copious illustrations. Each book of the series is to be arranged on the same plan, and with special reference to the capacity of the pupil. A systematized set of questions is added, by means of which the student is enabled briefly to memorize and digest all the important points as he proceeds. We have no doubt that Mr. Cornell's system will find great favor in the eyes of parents, teachers, and others within whose notice it is brought.

*Mile Stones in our Life Journey.* By SAMUEL OSGOOD. New York: D. Appleton & Co., 1855. A sort of religious biography, full of religious episodes. The author states it to have been written as a companion to a previous volume called "The Hearth-stone." The Rev. Samuel Osgood is a native of Massachusetts, and evidently thinks that State, and the things therein contained, the *ne plus ultra* of the earth. The native town of our author is of course *the town par excellence*. The hill on the side of which Mr. Osgood passed the early days of his boyhood was so celebrated, that "high Olympus" itself sunk into insignificance, and became a mere grassy mound. The doctor of Mr. Osgood's native village was an improvement upon Jenner and Abernethy combined, the minister, as Bossuet, content with the obscurity of a country town, and willing, if we may paraphrase a line, to "ope the gates of mercy to mankind"—even within the circumscribed limits of a hamlet; and, to cap the climax, Harvard University becomes an article of the orthodox creed, and a fundamental of allegiance. For this part of his book, Mr. Osgood deserves well of every person belonging to the "Massachusetts Mutual Admiration Society." The rest of the volume is made up of religious speculations which will doubtless find many admirers among such as agree with the views of their author.

In typography the book could not be improved.

*The World in the Middle Ages.* By A. L. KÆPPEN. New York: 1855. D. Appleton & Co. This work is emphatically what its name indicates—an historical geography of the world in the Middle Ages. The author in his preface states that while delivering a course of lectures,

two years ago, on Mediæval History, he could find no work of reference in English literature, hence his own conception and execution of the present large and comprehensive volume. In the course of the book we find accounts of the origin and development, the institutions and literature, the manners and customs of the nations in Europe, Western Asia, and Northern Africa, from the close of the fourth to the middle of the fifteenth century. To the work is appended a set of carefully prepared and handsomely colored maps, which will be found exceedingly useful in the prosecution of historical, geographical research into the period in question. The book is truly written, and is given in a shape which will render it popular with both the student and the man of science.

*The Life of Horace Greeley, Editor of the New York Tribune.* By J. PARTON. New York: Published by Mason Brothers. 1855. "Dedicated to the young men of the free States, by one of their number."

Biographies used to be written upon the tombstone. They are now issued as a continuous periodical posted up to the last paragraph of the distinguished subject. They set forth not a complete picture, but an imperfect sketch, which may be confirmed or contradicted by the future. The biography of Biddle, or of Burr, written *durante vita*, would have shamed by its appendix the eulogies of its text. Emmet postponed his epitaph—we apprehend, indefinitely. Men ambitious of fame might at least postpone the narration of their life till it is over. But they discount their posthumous fame for a present pittance of notoriety. Upon every principle of moral uncertainty, there is very little to receive. We have read stories in which a person feigns himself dead in order that he may hear the opinions of his friends and coffin-screwdrivers. Perhaps it may be with a similar purpose that men get up a chapter of their lives, that the world may say what it thinks in their hearing. We have nothing to say of the staple of modern biographies. Very hard-featured politicians have been for some years in the habit of chartering some rickety review, and by the aid of a photonomical discovery—in that respect unfortunate—have presented themselves in the frontispiece under a constrained and painful expression of countenance. Their picture is subscribed by their sign manual as they have been used to endorse it upon notes of hand. It is followed by a narrative of their infantile adventures. Their erratic education, their struggles and their triumphs. These are compiled up to the next Congressional election inclusive. The last chapters are seldom added. Much literature of that sort—and the public has borne much such literature in its pan-



niers—has encouraged the simultaneous publication of four auto-biographical fragments, purporting to be the lives of one Wickoff, who sings the repulsed love of an impudent adventurer with an eccentric and itinerant old maid. Of Barnum, who has magnified and rendered more shameful the minor meannesses of the Yankee character. Like some thimble rigger who has cheated the public into total non-intercourse, Barnum sells for the best price an exposition of his own roguery. Of the New York Tribune. But what a subject for biography is the Life of Horace Greeley! A writer ambitious of entire indifference to the reflected distinction of his subject, could adopt no more suitable hero. Let us consider this character as made out by the historian. One of Greeley's immediate progenitors, "though a captain, was not a military man, but a sharp, cunning, scheming, cool-headed, cold-hearted man, one who lived by his wits." The next seems to have been a cipher. Living in the midst of wars in which the safety of their country was involved, they seem to have never signalized their patriotism by military service. The hero of the story "could not stand up to a boy and fight;" "any loud noise like the report of a gun would throw him into convulsions. If a gun was about to be discharged, he would either run away as fast as his slender legs would carry him, or else he would throw himself on the ground and stuff grass in his ears to deaden the dreadful noise." This was constitutional cowardice. He was a passive non-resistant. He had been nicknamed "the ghost," from his lank and shadowy appearance. Certain mischievous boys sought to lay him as follows: "He had no sooner lighted his candle and got at work, than a ball, made of 'old roller,' whizzed past his ear and knocked over his candle. He set it straight again and went on with his work. Another ball, and another, and another, and finally a volley. One hit his 'stick,' one scattered his type, another broke his bottle, and several struck his head. He bore it till the balls came so fast, that it was impossible for him to work, as all his time was wasted in repairing damages. At length he turned round and said, without the slightest ill-humor, and in a supplicating tone, 'Now, boys, don't. I want to work. Please, now, let me alone.' When hunting he would never carry or discharge a gun, but when the game was found would lie down and stop his ears till the murder had been done."

"He was devoted to reading, but so wholly was he absorbed, that his father began at nine o'clock the task of recalling the absent mind from its roving, and moving the prostrate and dormant body. He would fish, but not for amusement. Other boys fished for sport, Horace fished



for fish." Significant distinction! He afterwards walked 120 miles to see his relatives. "He performed the journey, staid several weeks, and returned with a shilling or two more than he took with him." He sold out his right to drink liquor until twenty-one years of age, at a dead rent of one dollar. "Father, what will you give me, if I do not drink a drop of liquor until I am twenty-one?" "One dollar." "It's a bargain," said Horace. Now before this release of the pleasures of sin for a season the hero of Mr. Parton "had first either tasted a little liquor or else took a disgust at the smell of the stuff." Himself and his brothers "had a constitutional aversion to the taste of liquor and tobacco." He first ascertained that he could not drink, and then sold his engagement not to do what he could not, for a dollar!

He also sold torch wood splinters and wild honey. This was more honest and commendable. The personal appearance of Mr. Greeley was so little in his favor that he experienced great difficulty in obtaining employment, and at last, when taken by his father to be hired out to a printer, the bargain was nearly broken off by the length of time and rate of wages proposed. In the printing office he was again black-balled, to which with other and subsequent indignities he submitted in the most passive manner. Even when an editor the printers caricatured and quizzed him. His eccentricity is thus taken off:

"H. G., looking up from his work—Jonas, have I been to dinner?"

"Mr. Winchester—You ought to know best. I don't know."

"H. G.—John, have I been to dinner?"

"John—I believe not. Has he, Tom?"

"To which Tom would reply 'no,' or 'yes', according to his own recollection or John's wink; and if the office generally concurred in Tom's decision, Horace would either go to dinner or resume his work, in unsuspecting accordance therewith."

It was his boast that he "was not rocked in the cradle of gentility." Mr. Greeley became a Grahamite and a Fourierite. He was a partisan of Mr. Clay, and in his anxiety for the election of that statesman declared that slavery is a local institution, and that its abolition should not be subject to discussion in those States where it does not exist. Then he is sued for an alleged libel, and in spite of his own defence is made to pay damages. Subsequently he renounces the Whig party and devotes himself to the advocacy of Abolition. At the close of his life we leave him refusing to subscribe for the liberation of a slave, on the ground that he hopes to set them free for nothing, and he is slandering the people of the South with unabated volubility, when his biographer drops him. We have then a descriptive advertisement of the Tribune

office, and of every person connected with, it from the editor in chief to the paper folder.

We do not withhold from Mr. Greeley our commendation for his economy, industry, and punctuality. They are great virtues. We do not detract from his ability. He is a strong, coarse, nervous writer, a good logician who sometimes illustrates his argument with great felicity. But we think that his biographer shows him to be a coward, and his conduct shows him to be an incendiary. He who shuts his eyes at the sight of a gun, and goes home under the guard of two girls, would stimulate civil war and servile insurrection, with all their bloody consequences. He who has made it a rule to give nothing to the numerous calls of charity, and who will not contribute a cent to ransom those he considers unjustly held in bondage, calls upon the whole Southern people to surrender their property to satisfy an abstract opinion of his own.

The world is always anxious to read the acts of remarkable men, whether good or bad. Carew, the Gipsy; Dancer, the miser; Lambert, the "ton of man;" Buckingham, the man without arms or legs, have all had their lives written. Literature, like zoology and entomology, has its descriptive history, and not only should the peculiarities of the nobler animals be chronicled, but the more infamous reptiles should be marked that they may be avoided. But it is not usual to see the chronicler of any except the more virtuous and distinguished men take so deep and enthusiastic an interest in the events of their lives. Mr. Boswell has created great mirth by his obsequious admiration of Dr. Johnson, and Boswell was to be pardoned an exalted admiration of this leviathan of literature. But when we look upon the sordid, ungenerous, unsocial, and repulsive character of Mr. Greeley, how can we account for the enthusiasm of Mr. Parton? Only by supposing that those qualities are presented under such an exaggerated aspect as to command his admiration. The author and his subject are then congenial in their natures, and concurrent in their purposes, and the chief amongst these purposes is to create a slanderous prejudice against the Southern States. We have felt the best weapons from their armory, they are "slings and arrows" only. The South despises them. They are thrown by cowards against a tower of proof. They are the petty missiles which the Lilliputians hurled against Gulliver, who picked them out of his hands, as the stings of insects, but who, raising himself above their assaults, and covering his face with his handkerchief, was indifferent to their warfare.

Which then of these standard works is entitled to the highest commen-

dation?—Barnum, of whom it may be said, “Ferdinando Mendez Pinto was but a type of thee! thou liar of the first magnitude!”—Wickoff, who exaggerates in foreign countries the humiliating meannesses of his own,—Canot, an outlaw from the outraged laws of all nations, now consummating the shame of his crimes by the infamy of their publication, or—Greeley, who, born under the American Union, protected by its arms and laws, profiting by the intercourse with all its sections, seeks to turn his sectional enmity to profit, and connects his hopes of future honor with the prostration of the rights, the destruction of the interests, and the sacrifice of the lives of his fellow citizens? This question we cannot decide. But we shall await the sequel and appendix to the four biographies. We shall then see in what estimation men are held who vaunt their shameful practices as the incentive of patronage, and compete amongst themselves for the honorable meed of having committed more shocking enormities, more mercenary meannesses, or a more ungrateful appreciation of that country whose power has protected, and whose wealth has rewarded them.

*Party Leaders.* By JOSEPH T. BALDWIN. D. Appleton and Co. New York: 1855. This book is noticed in the body of the Review, and it is not necessary to call attention to its merits on this page.

*Flush Times of Alabama*, by the same author. Same publisher. This is a clever, sprightly, amusing book.

*Ancient History—from the Dispersion of the Sons of Noe to the Battle of Actium.* By PETER FREDET, D.D. Baltimore, Md., John Murphy & Co., 1854.

*Modern History—from the Coming of Christ and the change of the Roman Republic into an Empire to the Year of our Lord 1854.* By the same Author and Publisher, 1854.

*The Life of St. Alphonsus Maria de Liguori, Bishop of St. Agatha of the Goths.* By one of the Redemptorist Fathers. Baltimore: John Murphy & Co., 1855.

The above volumes were received too late for us to do more than merely acknowledge their reception, and to notice the excellence of the typography and very creditable finish.



## CONTENTS OF APRIL NUMBER.

---

ARTICLES.	PAGE.
I. BENTON'S THIRTY YEARS IN THE SENATE, . .	277
II. LOUIS XIV, . . . . .	303
III. THE CHIEF JUSTICES OF THE U. S. . . . .	331
IV. RUSKIN'S ARCHITECTURAL WORKS, . . . . .	372
V. THE RUSSO-TURKISH CAMPAIGNS, ETC. . . . .	382
VI. PRINCIPLES OF ART, . . . . .	398
VII. RUTH HALL, . . . . .	438
VIII. AMERICAN EDUCATION, . . . . .	451
IX. OBSERVATIONS ON THE HISTORY OF VIRGINIA, .	477
X. APPLICATIONS OF CHEMISTRY, . . . . .	506
XI. CRITICAL NOTICES, . . . . .	525

